

Volusia County Schools

Edith I. Starke 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Edith I. Starke Elementary School

730 S PARSONS AVE, Deland, FL 32720

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

Demographics

Principal: Eilene Ahr C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2020

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)	96%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%) 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	
* 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

Edith I. Starke achieves excellence through building relationships with all stakeholders to promote a positive, nurturing, respectful and supportive school culture. Through student-centered Professional Learning Communities and growth mindset we close the achievement and inspire ALL students to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement

We motivate students to Believe, Expect and Achieve to thrive as leaders in the 21st century.

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
Ahr, Eileen	Principal	To guide the instruction and structures that ensure student learning. To monitor instructional strategy effectiveness, teacher delivery of instruction effectiveness, and to provide specific timely feedback to ensure teacher growth. To collaborate to make school wide decisions to move the school forward.
Cervantes, Amy	Instructional Coach	To model, coach teachers to ensure their effectiveness in delivery of instruction in both whole group and small group. To use teacher and student data to guide their coaching that will increase student achievement. To collaborate to make school wide decisions to move the school forward.
Ruppen, Jessica	Instructional Coach	To model, coach teachers to ensure their effectiveness in delivery of instruction in both whole group and small group. To use teacher and student data to guide their coaching that will increase student achievement. To collaborate to make school wide decisions to move the school forward.
Williams, Willie	Assistant Principal	To monitor instructional strategy effectiveness, teacher delivery of instruction effectiveness, and to provide specific timely feedback to ensure teacher growth. To collaborate to make school wide decisions to move the school forward. To monitor teacher effectiveness in managing classroom procedures and expectations. To keep a safe and orderly campus.
Gentilhomme, Alvernise	Teacher, ESE	As a teacher leader Ms. Gentilhomme is to disseminate information to her team. Be the liaison between school and district for ESE needs, and collaborate to make school wide decisions.
Ramsey, Zena	Other	Dr. Ramsey is our PST Chair and Math Intervention Teacher. Her job duties are to meet students at their level and scaffold up to grade level. She is also to maintain and guide the PST process by guiding teachers to use the most appropriate intervention to ensure students success. As a team leader she is to disseminate information to her team and collaborate to make school wide decisions.
Mejia, Silvia	Other	Ms. Mejia is an ESOL teacher. Her job duties are to assess incoming students for placement in the ESOL program. To provide instruction to students based on their WIDA scores, and educate classroom teachers on the English Standards. As a teacher leader, she is to disseminate information back to her team and be the liaison between district and school

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	-------	---------------------------------

for her department, and collaborate to make school wide decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/31/2020, Eilene Ahr C

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

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)	96%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%)

	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	
* 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	16	76	55	54	68	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	332
Attendance below 90 percent	6	22	13	7	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	3	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/31/2020

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	77	52	54	83	54	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	20	13	10	23	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	6	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	77	52	54	83	54	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	387
Attendance below 90 percent	20	13	10	23	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	16	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	6	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	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	44%	56%	57%	43%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	42%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	46%	53%	42%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	53%	59%	63%	60%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	63%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	43%	51%	45%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	54%	57%	53%	57%	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	39%	58%	-19%	58%	-19%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	57%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	54%	-14%	58%	-18%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
	2018	48%	58%	-10%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	61%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	56%	-6%	53%	-3%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	28	37	29	37	50	41	33				
ELL	45	48	47	52	44	38	46				
BLK	41	51	43	49	46	31	55				
HSP	46	36	33	46	43	36	46				
WHT	42	75		68	68						
FRL	43	49	48	53	49	36	53				

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	33	41	31	40	53	50	55				
ELL	32	32	30	51	52	40					
BLK	40	45	44	55	62	38	54				
HSP	46	38	43	60	60	50	65				
WHT	52	48		74	71						
FRL	42	41	42	59	63	45	54				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	65
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	50
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

Our students with disabilities in ELA. - Our ESE population in our intermediate self-contained class was 37% of our lowest quartile. There was a new teacher in the classroom and multiple behaviors in the classroom.

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

Math Learning Gains- fourth grade was departmentalized, new teacher in the grade level responsible for all of the math.

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

Math Learning gains and Math Lowest quartile.-Teacher change in November, fourth grade was departmentalized and the new teacher was responsible for all of the math for the grade level.

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

ELA Learning Gains- we implemented and monitored small group structures.

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

Student attendance
Students with 2 or more indicators

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

1. Students with disabilities in ELA
2. Math Learning Gains
3. ELA Learning Gains
4. Student Attendance
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA data showed 39% of our students in the subcategory Students with Disabilities were performing at the proficient level. Which is under the 41% that is required. This is our ESSA subgroup.

Measureable Outcome: Increase ELA proficiency from 28% to 35% from with the subgroup Students with Disabilities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher led systematic small group instruction -

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: .47 effect size

Action Steps to Implement

- Training on structures for small group as needed
- Training on new writing and ELA curriculum
- Coaching/coaching video with feedback
- Administer iReady and analyze data to create small groups for instruction
- Support on UDL/collaborative structures strategies as needed
- Intervention support push-in
- Intentional conversation during PLCs about students with disabilities
- Needs based mentoring to improve mental readiness for learning

Person Responsible Eileen Ahr (ecahr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the FSA data our math Learning Gains dropped from 63% in 2018 to 48% in 2019.

Measureable Outcome: Move our math learning gains from 48% to 53%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Ruppen (jlruppe1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Students monitoring their own learning through data notebooks -
- Pre-assessment - diagnostic assessment to drive differentiate instruction
- Teacher led systematic small group instruction -

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students monitoring their own learning 1.33 effect size
 Pre-assessment
 Systematic small group instruction .47 effect size

Action Steps to Implement

- Training on data notebooks
- Training on structures for small group as needed
- Students monitoring their own learning using data notebooks
- Grade level power standards during intervention
- Support on implementing collaborative structures
- Coaching/Coaching video with feedback
- Intentional conversation during PLCs about students in the lowest quartile and learning gains
- Needs based mentoring to improve mental readiness for learning

Person Responsible Jessica Ruppen (jlruppe1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our FSA data showed an increase of 8% in this area. We would like to move this area from the C range to the B range to support our overall school grade.

Measureable Outcome: Move our ELA Learning Gains from 50% to 55%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Cervantes (alcervan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher led systematic small group instruction -

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: .47 effect size

Action Steps to Implement

- Training on structures for small group as needed
- Training on new writing and ELA curriculum
- Support on implementing collaborative structures
- Coaching/coaching video with feedback
- Administer iReady and analyze data to create small groups for instruction
- Support in gen ed classrooms for non-ESOL Hispanic students
- Intentional conversation during PLCs about students in the lowest quartile and learning gains
- Needs based mentoring to improve mental readiness for learning

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance will be addressed through class/school challenges. School Counselor will monitor and meet with parents.

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.

Everyone says good morning, respectful, no cliques, family environment, supportive environment, students, celebrate all cultures, embrace diversity, collaborative and growth mindset, we are about the students, teachers know the students need us, teachers doing what ever it takes to get it done.

Community- financially, business partners support, volunteers, mentors support. Monthly events are supported by the community.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00