
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Blue Lake Elementary School

282 N BLUE LAKE AVE, Deland, FL 32724

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

Demographics

Principal: Holly Bailey

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Blue Lake Elementary School is a Professional Learning Community committed to standards based instruction, small group intervention, and teacher collaboration to help ensure students reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bailey, Holly	Principal	To oversee the day to day operation of the school, including but not limited to, implementation of MTSS, weekly PLC meetings with data analysis, ensuring the safety and security of the campus, monitoring the PST process and early warning systems, and monitoring progress towards SIP Goals.
Benton, Stinette	Assistant Principal	Assists principal with overseeing day operation of the school, including but not limited to, implementation of MTSS, weekly PLC meetings with data analysis, ensuring the safety and security of the campus, monitoring the PST process and early warning systems, and monitoring progress towards SIP Goals.
Williams, Heather M	Math Coach	To provide professional learning opportunities and classroom support for teachers to facilitate improvement in the delivery and effectiveness of instruction in the critical areas of education that will enhance teacher quality and effectiveness to foster increased student achievement for all students.
Edwards, Emily	Reading Coach	To provide professional learning opportunities and classroom support for teachers to facilitate improvement in the delivery and effectiveness of instruction in the critical areas of education that will enhance teacher quality and effectiveness to foster increased student achievement for all students.
Reilly, Carly	Teacher, K-12	To provide specialized small group instruction to assist students who are not yet proficient on grade level skills. Intervention instruction may be provided in the classroom during small groups or in lab settings. Students are grouped based on performance on assessment data. The teachers differentiate instruction according to the areas of need. Progress is monitored to ensure effectiveness of instruction.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Borgos, Delly	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Desmond, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Kelly, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Miller, Terri	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Reid, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Sylvia, Ronda	Teacher, K-12	To promote the integration of instructional programs at the building level; facilitating team problem solving and the monitoring of the academic success of all students on the assigned team; and collaborating with the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		principal and other teachers on the building leadership team.
Fogle, Sarah	Teacher, ESE	To work diligently and conscientiously in the role of instructional personnel to help students meet or exceed annual learning goals, to meet state and local achievement requirements, and to master the skills required to graduate from high school prepared for postsecondary education and work.
Simmons, Amanda	Instructional Media	To provide leadership and supervision to instructional materials, media programs and utilization of technologies to support the instructional and media functions of Volusia County Schools.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/1/2021, Holly Bailey

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

550

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

17

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

19

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	77	87	86	96	76	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	508
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	15	15	17	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	35	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	5	2	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/17/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	87	82	93	96	79	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	15	13	15	14	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	6	1	4	4	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	16	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	13	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	4	13	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	7	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	87	82	93	96	79	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	15	13	15	14	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	6	1	4	4	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	16	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	13	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	21	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	4	13	22	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	7	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	29%	54%	-25%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	56%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	56%	-13%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

First Grade: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring ELA progress monitoring. Additionally, Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring Math progress monitoring.

Second Grade: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring ELA progress monitoring. Additionally, Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring Math progress monitoring.

Third Grade: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring ELA progress monitoring. Additionally, Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring Math progress monitoring.

Fourth Grade: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring ELA progress monitoring. Additionally, Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring Math progress monitoring.

Fifth Grade: ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring ELA progress monitoring. Additionally, Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1,2, and 3 (in that order) were used for fall, winter, and spring Math progress monitoring. Science progress was monitored through the use of VST 1,2, and 3 (in that order) for fall, winter, and spring.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	80/17.5%	82/28.05%	87/45.98%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/21.21%	67/26.87%	70/42.86%
	Students With Disabilities	9/0%	9/11.11%	9/11.11%
	English Language Learners	20/5%	20/15%	20/30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/8.97%	79/16.46%	83/48.19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/10.94%	64/14.06%	67/47.76%
	Students With Disabilities	9/0%	9/0%	9/0%
	English Language Learners	20/5%	19/5.26%	20/30.92%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73/15%	78/30.77%	82/47.56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/13.33%	65/29.23%	69/47.83%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8.33%	14/7.14%	13/7.69%
	English Language Learners	15/20%	16/12.5%	16/43.75%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72/6.94%	81/24.69%	81/44.44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/6.78%	67/19.40%	67/40.30%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0%	14/0%	13/15.38%
	English Language Learners	14/14.29%	16/6.25%	16/25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	80/36.25%	85/45.88%	88/63.64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/31.51%	78/42.31%	79/59.49%
	Students With Disabilities	21/14.29%	24/12.5%	24/41.67%
	English Language Learners	38/31.58%	40/40%	40/52.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	79/8.86%	81/18.52%	80/42.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	72/8.33%	74/14.86%	71/38.03%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0%	21/0%	20/20%
	English Language Learners	38/13.16%	37/16.22%	36/41.67%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	77/19.48%	86/31.40%	89/29.21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/16.44%	83/30.12%	84/27.38%
	Students With Disabilities	20/5%	22/9.09%	22/9.09%
	English Language Learners	24/12.5%	30/23.33%	31/19.35%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	79/6.33%	85/24.71%	83/46.99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75/5.33%	81/20.99%	78/44.87%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	22/9.09%	21/19.05%
	English Language Learners	28/3.57%	29/20.69%	28/39.29%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	74/14.47%	77/18.29%	81/26.09%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69/15.71%	71/15.79%	74/26.19%
	Students With Disabilities	22/0%	23/0%	25/3.23%
	English Language Learners	19/10.53%	20/14.29%	21/20.83%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70/7.14%	76/13.16%	85/44.71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/7.69%	70/12.86%	78/41.03%
	Students With Disabilities	20/0%	22/9.09%	26/30.77%
	English Language Learners	17/5.88%	20/10%	21/47.62%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	306/42%	279/44%	178/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	281/41%	257/40%	165/75%
	Students With Disabilities	100/43%	91/39%	53/77%
	English Language Learners	87/47%	74/50%	46/72%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	28	33	19	33	29	37				
ELL	24	33	45	42	41	39	26				
BLK	35	29	45	38	43	29	45				
HSP	32	36	40	48	41	33	31				
WHT	45	45		60	56	50	70				
FRL	35	36	49	47	45	35	44				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	51	45	19	58	58	27				
ELL	22	54	62	40	51	36					
BLK	36	72	53	39	63	54	24				
HSP	33	52	54	51	54	31	28				
WHT	54	54	30	54	56	54	47				
FRL	39	58	50	48	59	47	32				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	353
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

We had an overall decrease in Math Achievement (49 to 32), ELA Achievement (37 to 29), and Science achievement (47 to 27). We also had a decrease in our SWD (ELA- 13 to 11; Math- 19 to 14), ELL (Math-42 to 27), AA (ELA 35 to 18; Math 38 to 23) ESSA subgroups. .

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The data components with the greatest need for improvement are the Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (25), Science Achievement (27), and ELA Achievement (29).

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors for this need for improvement are the number of students that attended Volusia Live last school year and the high mobility rate of students. The new actions we will take are analyzing and responding to data throughout the year and revise and improve our PLC structure.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data component that showed the most improvement was 4th grade ELA Achievement. They increased by 2 points from 29 to 31.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors to this improvement were weekly collaborative planning and the sharing of resources. In addition the team completed a daily review and reflection of planning and pacing.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

The strategies that need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning are differentiation through small group instruction, analyze data and implement MTSS, improve standards-aligned instruction, and increase student engagement.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will facilitate the following professional learning:

- Diversity in Classroom Management
- Engagement Strategies (Kagan)
- Small Group Instruction in ELA
- Differentiated Instruction in Math and Science

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

In addition, we will be implementing tutoring for students, Stocktake meetings for the School Leadership Team, and provide mentoring for new teacher retention. Tutoring will take place before school, after school, and virtually in the evenings in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. By offering a variety of times, more students will be able to participate. In addition, we will offer science time during media special area to cover the fair game standards in 3rd-5th grade. Furthermore, each new teacher will receive a lead mentor and a grade level curriculum chair for support. The lead mentor will provide monthly professional learning opportunities for new teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains declined from 36% to 25%. Our Science Achievement declined from 47% to 27%.

Measureable Outcome: Increase Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains from 25% to 54%. Increase Science Achievement from 27% to 54%.

Monitoring: We will monitor district assessment data in weekly PLC and monthly SLT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Heather M Williams (hmwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will implement Differentiated instruction in Math to close the instructional gaps. Teachers will monitor formative assessments from class to identify the individual needs of each student. The teacher will provide scaffolding for students to demonstrate mastery of the individual standards. In addition, teachers will monitor the Response to Intervention from the differentiated instructional groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, RTI (differentiated instruction) has an effect size of 1.07. Teachers will provide individualized scaffolding for students to demonstrate mastery of the standards. In addition, teachers will monitor the Response to Intervention from the differentiated instructional groups to ensure academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Differentiation. On Math FSA, the overall Math Achievement decreased from 49 to 32% proficiency.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hm Bailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Differentiation during ERPLs.

Person Responsible Heather M Williams (hmwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Heather M Williams (hmwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hm Bailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Information

Additional information regarding this instructional practice is available in the attached document.

For more information, please contact the person responsible for this practice.

For more information, please contact the person responsible for this practice.

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for differentiated instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible Heather M Williams (hmwillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning EVERY day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Achievement declined from 37% to 29%.

Measureable Outcome: Increase ELA Achievement from 29% to 54%.

Monitoring: We will monitor district assessment data in weekly PLC and monthly SLT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will implement differentiated instruction in teacher led small groups to ensure the adequate scaffolding of standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, small group instruction has a .49 effect size and RTI (differentiated instruction) has an effect size of 1.07. Teachers will provide individualized scaffolding for students to demonstrate mastery of the ELA standards. In addition, teachers will monitor the Response to Intervention from the differentiated instructional groups to ensure academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of small group instruction. On ELA FSA, the overall ELA achievement decreased from 37% to 29% proficient.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Small Group instruction during ERPLs.

Person Responsible Emily Edwards (eedward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Emily Edwards (eedward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for differentiated instruction within teacher led small group instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible Emily Edwards (eedward@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The percent of students scoring proficient in ELA, Math and Science Achievement for the following subgroups is below 41%: SWD (ELA-11, Math-14, Science-10), ELL (ELA-25, Math-27, Science-28), Hispanic (ELA-28, Math-31, Science- 25), and AA (ELA-18, Math- 23, Science-21).

Measureable Outcome: Students in the following subgroups (SWD, ELL, Hispanic, and AA) will increase the percent proficient subgroup to 41% in ELA, Math, and Science Achievement).

Monitoring: We will monitor district assessment data in weekly PLC and monthly SLT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-aligned small group and differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to John Hattie, RTI utilizing differentiated instruction has an effect size of 1.07 and small group instruction has a .49 effect size. Teachers will provide individualized scaffolding for students in the ESSA subgroups to demonstrate mastery of the ELA, Math, and Science standards. In addition, teachers will monitor the Response to Intervention from the differentiated instructional groups to ensure academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of small group instruction and differentiation with ESSA subgroups.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Differentiation and Small Group instruction during ERPLs.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of Focus Boards in every classroom that include Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for differentiated small-group instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible Holly Bailey (hmbailey@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

After comparing our school's SESIR incident and discipline data to other schools across the state, we have identified fighting as an area of concern. It is ranked moderate. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School Will

- implement Hacking School Discipline book study
- implement Mentoring program
- provide a refresher for teachers in SEL strategies

Teachers Will:

- Develop clear expectations with students and other strategies to solve a conflict without fighting.
- monitor students closely when transitioning.

Discipline data chats will take place during PLC meetings to discuss the above implementation plan based on the data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Blue Lake Elementary will continue to award positive house points through the use of it's house system. Additionally, we will highlight our "terrific kids" through the use of bulletin boards and television media announcements. Weekly, our school counselor will also provide us with a "word of the week" which will be incorporated into SEL, and social media posts.

Furthermore, we look forward to initiating a PBIS team which includes the use of positive "Dynamic Dolphin" referrals, and implementing "Smarty Parties" for students who achieve academic goals.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Blue Lake is blessed to have so many people who assist in promoting a positive culture at our school. Below is a list of certain stakeholder group and their contribution to the Blue Lake community.

- Teachers: Incentivize students/ SEL daily/ Model desired behaviors/ Mentor students (Dolphin to Dolphin)
- Students: Conflict mediation/ Building relationships/ Student voice through surveys/ Collaborating through the house system to build relationships.
- Families of students: Follow the Title 1 Compact agreement
- Volunteers: Assist as needed throughout the year with students/ participate as a mentor, events and celebrations/ Rotary club to mentor students
- School Board Members: Highlight us on Social Community Colleges/ read to students
- Colleges: and universities: Stetson PLL/SAC/One book one school/Walk to school day, Florida Master Gardener program through University of Florida (UF/IFAS)
- Social Service: House Next Door which provides counseling services
- Community Partners: Jewish foundation which provides school supplies/ Junior Service League provides jackets and clothing/ American Legion provides school supplies and helps to assist students with community service projects/ Volusia Fuel provides food for students/Deland Dawgs mentor students/ Deland High Achievers supply reading assistance to students.
- Business Partners: Jeremiah's Ice contributes a monetary donation of 50/50/ Forever Snowy/ Boulevard Tire also contributes a monetary reward for student/staff recognition.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00