

Volusia County Schools

R. J. Longstreet Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

R. J. Longstreet Elementary School

2745 S PENINSULA DR, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

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

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Haubrich

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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)	72%
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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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

R. J. Longstreet, in partnership with our community, will empower students to become compassionate, lifelong learners who are responsible, productive and engaged citizens within our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement

Students strive to achieve their maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring and challenging learning environment.

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
Haubrich, Melissa	Principal	The principal is responsible for the school's academic success which includes monitoring and tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.
Schuld, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Scaccia, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal with monitoring the school's academic success which includes tracking the academic and social-emotional performance of students and responding expediently when students demonstrate areas of concern. This leader also evaluates and monitors the effectiveness of instructional activities taking place within classrooms and provides follow-up actions as needed. The assistant principal establishes an orderly, safe and secure school environment.
Marcus, Sarah	Guidance Counselor	The school counselor provides for the social-emotional competencies of all students through school counseling efforts and programs.
Rajcooar, Christina	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Henderson, Marge	Instructional Coach	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.
Legath, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the school leadership team, she works to assist in monitoring schoolwide data and participates in activities designed to target areas of academic concern.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Melissa Haubrich

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.*

17

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 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)	72%
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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	77	60	58	73	66	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	17	11	10	9	17	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	1	1	6	1	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	4	9	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	7	8	4	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/21/2020

Prior Year - 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	80	64	61	74	69	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	421
Attendance below 90 percent	21	16	14	14	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	7	8	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	80	64	61	74	69	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	421
Attendance below 90 percent	21	16	14	14	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	7	8	5	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	62%	56%	57%	58%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	56%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	46%	53%	44%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	63%	49%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	56%	56%	62%	42%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	43%	51%	26%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	58%	57%	53%	64%	58%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	58%	3%	58%	3%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	59%	0%	64%	-5%
	2018	50%	60%	-10%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%
	2018	63%	56%	7%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	21	29	33	30	42	35	27				
ELL	36	60		45	55						
BLK	37	38		33	46						
HSP	50	62		38	56		30				
MUL	65	47		58	53						
WHT	68	57	52	61	58	45	59				
FRL	56	54	53	47	50	38	51				

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	26	52	42	23	33	20	39				
ELL	23			38	55						
BLK	21	28	27	25	20		18				
HSP	41	62		47	43						
MUL	65	57		45	50						
WHT	64	59	44	52	46	30	72				
FRL	52	55	42	43	40	27	62				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	50
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	39
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	47
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	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	51
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

Lowest quartile students in Math (38%)

FSA Math 2018 data showed 26% of students in our lowest quartile made a gain. We organized professional learning activities and coaching support targeting math instruction for the 2019 school year which supported a 12% increase in our 2019 LQ math score. Factors that prevented a larger increase in this percentage included our mobility rate of 33%, a high percentage of homeless attending our school (15%), and students in this subgroup with significant social-emotional needs

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

Science (-6%)

Science NGSSS trends show our school score increases then declines on this assessment mainly due to the fact that teachers focus more on ELA and math instruction.

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

Lowest Quartile in Math (School 38%, State 51%= -13%)

The greatest gap, our lowest quartile at 38%- was also one of our biggest increases on FSA second to math learning gains which improved by 14%. We provided targeted math coaching and professional learning activities that we feel supported this improvement. We also organized regular data monitoring meetings with teachers where strategies targeting areas of student deficiencies were developed.

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

Math Learning Gains (2018- 42%; 2019- 56%= 14%)

Our biggest increase on FSA was math learning gains which improved by 14%. We provided targeted math coaching and professional learning activities that we feel supported this improvement. We also organized regular data monitoring meetings with teachers where strategies targeting areas of student deficiencies were developed.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Level 1 on Statewide Assessments
Attendance

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Black/African American Students
3. Math Lowest Quartile
4. Math Learning Gains
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The EdData and FLDOE states that Students with Disabilities is an underperforming subgroup. Our percentage is at 31%.
Measureable Outcome:	R. J. Longstreet plans to increase the performance of this ESSA group on ELA and Math FSA 20201 in measurable performance areas to 44%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention (RTI)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies are a powerful way to provide individualized and targeted instruction for students in the greatest need of attention.
Action Steps to Implement	
1. Use ReadyReading (comprehension) daily for 20 to 30m for Tier 2 or 3 students needing this support	
Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
2. Use targeted phonics instruction daily for 45m for Tier 3 students needing this support	
Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
3. Use targeted math intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills	
Person Responsible	Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
4. Monitor monthly the use of Wilson Reading System, Ready Reading and Math Small Group during grade level Professional Learning Communities regarding Students with Disabilities.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
5. Quarterly monitoring of SWD performance in ELA and math	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
6. Monitor classroom and ESE support facilitation small group instruction /schedules to ensure daily intervention for Tier 3 SWD in ELA and/or math occur.	
Person Responsible	Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
7. Monitor during PLCs utilizing district topic assessments	
Person Responsible	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
8. One on one data chats quarterly.	

Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. Data chats in PLC weekly.

Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

10. Teachers will participate in professional development focused on gathering data, grouping students, planning for small group, implementing individualized instructional support, assess

Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of possible points earned by our Black/African American students in ELA and Math FSA 2019 was 39%.
Measureable Outcome:	R.J. Longstreet plans to increase the performance of this ESSA group on ELA and Math FSA 2020 in measurable performance areas to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention (RTI) Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies are a powerful way to provide individualized and targeted instruction for students in the greatest need of attention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use ReadyReading (comprehension) daily for 20 to 30m for Tier 2 or 3 students needing this support
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
2. Use targeted phonics instruction daily 20 to 30m for Tier 2 to 3 students needing this support
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
3. Use targeted math intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
4. Monitor monthly the use of SIPPS, Ready Reading and Math Small Group during grade level Professional Learning Communities.
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
5. Quarterly monitoring of Black/African American student performance in ELA and math
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
6. Monitor classroom instruction/schedules to ensure daily intervention for Tier 2 and 3 students in ELA and/or math occur
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
7. Monitor utilizing district provided topic assessments during PLCs
Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
8. Teachers will participate in professional development focused on gathering data, grouping students, planning for small group, implementing individualized instructional support, assess
Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area reported the greatest decrease in achievement from the previous year (6%).
Measureable Outcome:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use of SMT data to track 2. Increase FSA science achievement to 62% 3. Collaborative Standards Aligned Planning- all grade levels using scienc NGSSS
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Collaborative Standards Aligned Planning - all grade levels using science NGSSS</p> <p>Collective Efficacy has an effect size of 1.57 according to John Hattie. In order for our 5th grade students to consistently achieve at the highest level, science must be taught using best-practices aligned with NGSSS at all grade levels.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review the Vertical Trace Maps for four areas of science.
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
2. Quarterly planning days for all grade levels targeting science instruction
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
3. Administrative science learning walks
Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
4. Quarterly collaboration and articulation across all grade levels.
Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
5. Professional learning focused on standards aligned instruction in science
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
6. Science learning walks with teachers
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	38% of the lowest quartile in math made a gain.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase Math Lowest Quartile to 50%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intervention and Enrichment block Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies are a powerful way to provide individualized and targeted instruction for students in the
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	greatest need of attention. According to John Hattie, Response to Intervention (RTI) has a 1.07 effect size. This will be integral within the Intervention and Enrichment block.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use iReady/Freckle daily for 20 to 30m for Tier 2 or
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
2. Use targeted instruction daily for 30-45m for Tier 3 students needing this support
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
3. Use targeted math intervention in small group by providing instruction on prerequisite concepts and skills
Person Responsible Marge Henderson (mehender@volusia.k12.fl.us)
4. Monitor weekly the use of iReady data, Freckle data, math topic assessment data, and Math Small Group during grade level Professional Learning Communities regarding the math lowest quartile.
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
5. Weekly monitoring of math lowest quartile performance in math
Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)
6. Monitor classroom and ESE support facilitation small group instruction /schedules to ensure daily intervention for Tier 3 in math.
Person Responsible Kimberly Scaccia (kascacci@volusia.k12.fl.us)
7. Teachers will participate in professional development focused on gathering data, grouping students, planning for small group, implementing individualized instructional support, assess
Person Responsible Melissa Haubrich (mhaubric@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

After completing our needs assessment and identifying our Areas of Focus, the data shows that attendance is another area of concern. We have established school-wide attendance initiatives to encourage daily attendances including:

- 1. Daily tracking of attendance.**
- 2. Automated phone call home when a family has not reported excused absence.**
- 2. School staff (teacher, attendance clerk, administration, etc.) will personally contact family after 5 days of unexcused absences.**
- 3. School Social Worker at contact family at 10 days of unexcused absences.**
- 4. PST process for attendance concerns.**
- 5. Daily attendance recognized by providing attendance bracelets for FREE Dress Days. Students are allowed to come to school in school appropriate attire that is outside of our school uniform.**
- 6. Class attendance rewards for perfect daily attendance.**

Principal, Assistant Principal and School Counselor will monitor attendance 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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school offers the following list to ensure the needs of all student are met:

- *Sanford Harmony
- *Bully Proofing Program
- *Caring Cardinal Program
- *Student Mentoring Program
- *THRIVE Skills Instruction
- *Cardinal Dads
- *Cardinal Tweets
- *School Resources Officer Mentor
- *Community partnerships with Ponce Inlet Lions Club, Drive-In Church, and Food Brings Hope respond to the nutritional needs of our students.
- *Community partnerships with Ponce Inlet Lions Club and Cherise's Salon respond to the clothing needs of our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
-----------------------	--	--	--

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00