

Volusia County Schools

Coronado Beach Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Coronado Beach Elementary School

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

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

Demographics

Principal: Tracy Buckner A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	8
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Coronado Beach Elementary School

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) Elementary School PK-5	2018-19 Title I School No	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 10%

School Grades History

Year Grade	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
	A	A	A	C

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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

Coronado Beach Elementary School:

“From marine science to agriscience, educating the next generation of critical thinkers and problem solvers

Provide the school's vision statement

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Buckner, Tracy	Principal	
Bartley, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Bass, Erin	Teacher, K-12	
Canfield, Jessica	Guidance Counselor	
Cloer, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	
Pecoroni, Jason	Teacher, K-12	
Quigley, Kim	Instructional Coach	
Reilly, Carly	Teacher, K-12	
Wassem, Christine	Teacher, K-12	
Wendt, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	
Sokerka, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
Mullins, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	47	36	38	48	35	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	249
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	6	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/10/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	56%	57%	71%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	56%	58%	67%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	53%	53%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	78%	59%	63%	83%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	71%	56%	62%	75%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	43%	51%	75%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	79%	57%	53%	79%	58%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	47 (0)	36 (0)	38 (0)	48 (0)	35 (0)	45 (0)	249 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 ()	4 ()	6 ()	5 ()	3 ()	1 ()	27 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: 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
03	2019	82%	58%	24%	58%	24%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	54%	24%	58%	20%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
	2018	74%	58%	16%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	59%	9%	64%	4%
	2018	91%	60%	31%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-23%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	84%	54%	30%	60%	24%
	2018	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
	2018	76%	56%	20%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data											
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	33	30		42	64						
HSP	75			67							

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
WHT	78	73	50	82	72	50	81				
FRL	64	68	45	64	65	50	77				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31			31							
WHT	72	67	58	84	75	83	78				
FRL	56	59	50	76	86	91	75				

ESSA Data

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	465
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	71
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	69
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

ELA Lowest Quartile showed the lowest performance in 2019. ELA Lowest Quartile also showed as our lowest performing group in 2018. This indicates a trend. Some contributing factors may be that there was a lack of knowledge in the area of progression of standards.

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

Math Lowest Quartile showed the greatest decline from the year prior. In 2018 75% of Math Lower Quartile students scored proficient where as in 2019, 47% of students earned proficient scores. This can be contributed to lack of knowledge of the progression of the math standards.

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

In 2019, 5th grade science had the greatest gap when comparing to state average. This was a positive gap with 53% of students earning proficient scores at the state level compared to 79% of students in the school.

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

The area of ELA Achievement showed the most improvement from 2018-2019. This can be attributed to frequent PLC discussions where walk to intervention data was shared in order to allow for flexible grouping according to student need. Additionally, the school improvement focus of establishing collective efficacy through collaboration may have contributed to this positive gain.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance below 90% (23 out of 249 students or 9.3%)

Number of students with a level 1 on state assessment (7 out of 249 students or 2.8%)

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%
2. Math Lowest 25%
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lower Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, in addition to our 2019 FSA data, 44% of our lower quartile students scored proficient. This is below the district average of 46% and below the state average of 53%. Additionally, this proficiency percentage showed a decline from 2018 where 53% of our lower quartile students scored proficient which was above both the district and state average.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase proficiency in ELA Lowest Quartile from 44% to 47%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards aligned small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to the research of John Hattie.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review ELA learning gain data to discuss interventions 2. Coaching on Small Group Instruction 3. Collaborative planning sessions to plan for instruction 4. learning walks 5. monitor small group instruction 6. Quarterly progress monitoring meetings 7. PLC meetings to review student data 8. Professional Learning for ELA instruction
Person Responsible	Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2

Title

Math Lower Quartile

Rationale

As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, in addition to our 2019 FSA data, 47% of our Lower Quartile students scored proficient. This is above the district average of 43% but below the state average of 51%. Additionally, this proficiency percentage showed a decline from 2018 where 75% of our lower quartile students scored proficient which was above both the district and state average.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve

The percentage of Math lower quartile students will increase from 47% to 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Standards Aligned Small Group Instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to the research of John Hattie.

Action Step

Description

- 1 Review math lower quartile data to discuss any needed interventions
2. Coaching on Small Group Instruction
3. Collaborative planning sessions to plan for instruction
4. learning walks
5. monitor small group instruction
6. Quarterly progress monitoring meetings
7. PLC meetings to review student data
8. Professional Learning for math instruction

Person Responsible

Tracy Buckner (tabuckne@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lower Quartile				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20

	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1237 - Coronado Beach Elementary Schl	General Fund	249.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: The items below may be considered as Professional Learning Opportunities for the purpose of School Improvement: FETC/ISTE or other Technology focused conference PLC learning opportunity/conference Professional Learning in the area of writing UDL International Summit Conferences/Learning Opportunities that will support ESE students and teachers. Other Professional Learning to support best practices. Student Engagement conferences/opportunities Professional Learning to enhance best practices as evidenced by the research of John Hattie or other contributors to Visible Learning.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Lower Quartile				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	7200	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	1237 - Coronado Beach Elementary Schl	General Fund	249.0	\$0.00
			<i>Notes: The items below may be considered as Professional Learning Opportunities for the purpose of School Improvement: FETC/ISTE or other Technology focused conference PLC learning opportunity/conference Professional Learning in the area of writing UDL International Summit Conferences/Learning Opportunities that will support ESE students and teachers. Other Professional Learning to support best practices. Student Engagement conferences/opportunities Professional Learning to enhance best practices as evidenced by the research of John Hattie or other contributors to Visible Learning.</i>			
					Total:	\$0.00