

Volusia County Schools

Turie T. Small Elementary School



2021-22 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Turie T. Small Elementary School

800 SOUTH ST, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

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

Demographics

Principal: Melani Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 11/5/2019

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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]
* 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.

The Turie T. Small Elementary family will create an academic, safe, and respectful environment to ensure our children will learn and reach their full potential to compete in our global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to be successful contributors to our democratic society.

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
Johnson, Melani	Principal	<p>As the school's primary instructional leader, the principal communicates a vision for student achievement and guides the team's work. The principal works closely with the school's leadership team to determine the needs of Turie T. Small Elementary. The school-based leadership team identifies school-based needs and resources (materials and personnel) to determine how to best support students and teachers. Team members represent a leader from each grade level and department, with expertise in the areas of ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies; primary, intermediate grades, and exceptional students. Each member of the instructional leadership team serves as the liaison between leadership and their grade level team. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of problem solving teams and professional learning communities. Teacher feedback, classroom observations and student performance data are also considered.</p>
McAndrew, Amber	Assistant Principal	<p>Discipline Safety and Security Facilities Transportation Lunch duty Meet the Teacher Open House Custodians Wellness Cheerleader Schedules/Schedule changes: Lunch, Supervision Rotation, Logistics, etc. ESE Administrator Paraprofessionals PST New Bulldogs Mentoring and Monthly Meetings Professional Development Contact Interns contact Awards ceremonies quarterly</p>
Yoder, Milton	Instructional Coach	<p>Coaching teachers on best practices Model lessons/Observe lessons and provide feedback Co-teach a lesson Teach Intervention (grade level specific) Data Analysis Tutoring Facilitator Schoolwide Professional Development Coordinator</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Assist with curriculum design Lead a book study/action research
Coates, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Teacher PTA Vice President
Jackson, Shaunia	Teacher, K-12	Intervention Teacher PST Chair
Folkerts, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	ESE Support Facilitator Testing Coordinator
Eichinger, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	DLTL
Metakes, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Gibbs, Christopher	Teacher, K-12	FEA coordinator
Morrow, Porscha	Teacher, K-12	
Sessoms, Angel	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 11/5/2019, Melani Johnson

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

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

455

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

10

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

11

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	65	73	69	76	81	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	30	35	22	34	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	175
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	6	1	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	2	1	3	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 11/10/2021

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	47	64	85	80	60	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	27	22	41	21	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	47	64	85	80	60	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	27	22	41	21	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	28%			44%	56%	57%	41%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	40%			60%	56%	58%	47%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%			55%	46%	53%	39%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	34%			56%	59%	63%	44%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	32%			65%	56%	62%	39%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%			56%	43%	51%	38%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	30%			36%	57%	53%	59%	58%	55%

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	52%	54%	-2%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	54%	-23%	56%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	67%	59%	8%	64%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used is iReady Diagnostics 1, 2, and 3 in grades 1st-5th in both reading and math. Science was assessed with the Volusia Science Test in fifth grade.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		54 /11.11%	60 /11.67%	69 /40.58%
	Economically Disadvantaged		53 /9.43%	57 /10.53%	65 /38.46%
	Students With Disabilities		8 /0%	10 /0%	10 /0%
	English Language Learners		3 /0%	3 /0%	4 /25%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		57 /12.28%	60 /16.67%	72 /31.94%
	Economically Disadvantaged		56 /10.71%	57 /15.79%	67 /32.84%
	Students With Disabilities		9 /22.22%	11 /36.36%	9 /44.44%
	English Language Learners		3 /0%	3 /0%	3 /22.40%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65 / 13.85%	71 / 18.31%	48 / 33.33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65 / 13.85%	71 / 18.31%	46 / 34.78%
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 0%	7 / 0%	4 / 0%
	English Language Learners	5 / 0%	5 / 20%	4 / 25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	63 / 7.94%	74 / 12.16%	49 / 24.49
	Economically Disadvantaged	63 / 7.94%	74 / 12.33%	47 / 25.53%
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 20%	7 / 14.29%	3 / 0%
	English Language Learners	5 / 0%	5 / 20%	1 / 100%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76 / 31.58%	81 / 40.74%	75 / 50.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75 / 30.67%	79 / 41.77%	69 / 52.17%
	Students With Disabilities	9 / 11.11%	11 / 9.09%	9 / 22.22%
	English Language Learners	5 / 20%	4 / 25%	4 / 25%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71 / 1.41%	84 / 9.52%	89 / 50.56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70 / 1.43%	82 / 8.54%	84 / 53.57%
	Students With Disabilities	9 / 0%	11 / 9.09%	9 / 22.22%
	English Language Learners	4 / 0%	4 / 50%	2 / 50%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	57 /15.79%	77 / 14.29%	69 /21.74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56 /14.29%	74 / 13.51%	66 / 21.21%
	Students With Disabilities	18 / 0%	27 / 3.70%	21 / 4.76%
	English Language Learners	2 / 0%	2 /0%	2 /0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56 /3.57%	74 / 13.51%	71 / 26.76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	55 /1.82%	71 / 12.68%	68 / 26.47%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 0%	26 /3.85%	19 / 15.79%
	English Language Learners	2 / 0%	2 / 0%	3 /33.33%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58/ 11.86%	67/ 22.22%	68/ 25.30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57/ 10.34%	64/ 20.51%	61/ 25%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 7.69%	15/ 8.70%	15/ 15%
	English Language Learners	4/ 0%	4/ 25%	5/ 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	57 / 10.53%	78 / 20.51%	72 / 44.44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	56 / 8.93%	75 / 18.67%	62 / 46.77%
	Students With Disabilities	12 / 0%	17 /11.76%	16 / 25%
	English Language Learners	4 /0%	4/ 0%	5 / 40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	229 / 25%	202 /45%	170 /70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	224 /25%	194 / 45%	157/68%
	Students With Disabilities	45 /15%	41 / 70%	29/ 58%
	English Language Learners	13 / 25%	13 / 67%	10/ 100%

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
SWD	14	23		19	31		17				
ELL											
BLK	24	34		29	28	50	29				
WHT	52			60							
FRL	27	38	36	33	30	42	28				
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	18	32	31	25	57	50	16				
BLK	41	59	55	55	66	57	33				
HSP	29	50		46	45						
MUL	50			58							
WHT	69	63		65	75						
FRL	45	61	55	57	65	56	37				
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	18	29	25	15	23	24	17				
BLK	40	48	29	43	38	29	55				
HSP	31	27		50	55						
MUL	69			38							
WHT	40			53							
FRL	41	47	39	44	39	38	59				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	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	32
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	56
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

According to iReady Diagnostics there were trends across all grade levels at Turie T. Small. In ELA, third grade's tier 1 increased by 19% from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. Fourth grade increased by 7% and fifth grade increased by 17%. Also, in iReady Math, third grade's tier 1 demonstrated a 47% growth, fourth grade's was 25% and 5th grade's was 36%. The VSTs were consistent in percentages however, proficiency levels were below the district average. The 2021 FSA data demonstrates a decrease in all areas as compared to 2019. There was a decrease of 16% in ELA achievement, 22% in math achievement and Science achievement decreased by 6%.

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

Although Turie T. Small made growth from ELA iReady Diagnostic 1 to 3, ELA is an area that needs the greatest improvement. Based on the 2019 FSA Achievement, ELA proficiency was 44% and decreased to 28% in 2021.

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 the need for improvement at Turie T. Small was student attendance, learning loss for students that received virtual instruction and teacher retention. Another factor is that at the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year, support teachers were assigned to cover teacher vacancies. Due to this, support teachers could not meet with struggling students. In order to improve in these areas we would have to increase parent involvement to reduce attendance concerns, ensure that instruction is rigorous and aligned to state standards, and to secure teachers by providing support and resources to meet teacher and student needs.

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

The data component that demonstrated the most improvement was iReady Diagnostic Math across grade levels.

From iReady 1 to 3, third grade increased their tier 1 by 47%, 4th grade increased by 25% and 5th grade increased by 36%.

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

At the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year, math was not an area of focus associated with our SIP. However, after reviewing the data we added math as part of our SIP. The contributing factors for the improvement was having more of a focus on math whole and small group instruction. Teachers also followed the math block structure plan. Collaborative teacher planning was focused on doing the math to know the math, so that teachers would have knowledge of what to teach, how to teach it, and plan for student misconceptions.

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

Several strategies will be utilized to help in learning growth. Teacher clarity is one strategy that will be implemented this year. Teacher clarity is teaching that is organized, intentional, teachers know how students learn and what they know, and the teacher and student know the success criteria. Focused collaborative planning and diving deeper into the curriculum will assist teachers to be better prepared for instruction. Additionally, data chats that are focused on evaluating the data, identifying misconceptions, and action planning will accelerate learning.

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.

The following strategies will be implemented to accelerate learning:

Teacher Clarity trainings at ERPL and faculty meetings

PLC Data Chats

Bechmark Overview training

iReady training

Core Connections training

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

District Support in ELA, Math and Science

School based learning walks to monitor instruction

KidZone to support student learning and progress

Tutoring to support students by remediating skills

Part III: Planning for Improvement**Areas of Focus:**

#1. 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 everyday. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it revealed our ELA proficiency was 28%. ELA learning gains were 40% and the lowest quartile performed at 36% which was below the district and state averages. Further analysis revealed that most students in our lowest quartile were also part of our ESSA subgroups of SWD and AA.

Measureable Outcome: Increase ELA overall proficiency from 28% to 44%. Increase ELA lowest quartile learning gains from 36% to 55% including ESSA subgroups.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthroughs tools with specific ELA look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence based strategy will be small group instruction. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school based administrators, coaches and district support teams. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction for input on students' learning and determining next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that small group instruction has an effect size of .47 (Hattie, 2009). The average effect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. This will allow us to provide stronger response to intervention which has an effect size of 1.07 and increase classroom and small group discussion which has an effect size of .82 (Hattie, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data SLT examine that determined the need for implementation of effective small group instruction.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning and effective small group instruction during ERPL's, PLCs, and teacher duty days.

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of focus boards in every classroom that includes learning targets/ learning intentions and success criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/bench mark, lesson and task. Planning will include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide work examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administer district assessments (iReady, Unit Assessments, Weekly Assessments following the district calendar. Conduct PLCs monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student data to adjust instruction and plan for interventions.

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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 everyday. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it revealed our Math proficiency was 34%. Math learning gains were 32%% and the lowest quartile performed at 42% which was below the district and state averages. Further analysis revealed that most students in our lowest quartile were also part of our ESSA subgroups of SWD and AA.

Measureable Outcome: Increase Math overall proficiency from 34% to 56%. Increase Math lowest quartile learning gains from 42% to 56% including ESSA subgroups.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthroughs tools with specific Math look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidence based strategy will be small group instruction. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school based administrators, coaches and district support teams. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction for input on students' learning and determining next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is that small group instruction has an effect size of .47 (Hattie, 2009). The average effect size is .40 which is equal to approximately one year of learning. This will allow us to provide stronger response to intervention which has an effect size of 1.07 and increase classroom and small group discussion which has an effect size of .82 (Hattie, 2009).

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data SLT examine that determined the need for implementation of effective small group instruction.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning and effective small group instruction during ERPL's, PLCs, and teacher duty days.

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use of focus boards in every classroom that includes learning targets/ learning intentions and success criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/bench mark, lesson and task. Planning will include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide work examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use best practices in math instruction including the use of manipulatives and fluency instruction and exposure to various question types.

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning everyday. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis it revealed our Science proficiency was 30%. Students in both ESSA subgroups performed below district and state averages. SWD performed at 17% and our AA subgroup performed at 29%.

Measureable Outcome: Increase Science overall proficiency from 30% to 41%.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using walkthroughs tools with specific Science look-fors, and PLC data chats to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Also, hands on/minds on investigations and 5E instructional strategies will be utilized.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Our evidenced-based strategy is teacher clarity. We will monitor it through frequent walk through by administration, coaches and district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher Clarity has an effect size of .75 (Hattie, 2009). The average affect size is .40 which is approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. This correlates to science instruction by utilizing best practices including standards aligned instruction, common experiments, investigations and hands-on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs, SLTs, and Teacher Duty Days.

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@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 Melani Johnson (myjohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Work with district support team to engage in ongoing clarity work during faculty meetings, PLCs and professional learning. Questioning techniques will be incorporated into their discussions including: where are we going? Where are we now? how do we move learning forward?

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Utilize district common experiments and hands-on activities during science instruction.

Person Responsible Milton Yoder (yamilton@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, we have identified our out of school suspension rate as an area of concern. It is ranked as a very high concern. Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

The school will:

- train teachers in PBIS and Restorative Practice
- identify mentors for students with high incidents
- provide incident data to teachers monthly at faculty meetings

The teachers will:

- utilize strategies within the classroom to support PBIS
- develop clear expectations with students
- students will be monitored during transitions and recess

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.

Our school is continuing an important district initiative. It is called Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS). Turie T. Small will continue this initiative this school year. We will grow through increased parent awareness and participation.

A component of the PBIS system is the use of consistent positive rewards to celebrate students' success. Students who exhibit positive behaviors will be recognized by teachers and administrators.

Our goal is to teach children alternate behaviors to ensure a school environment that is safe, fun, free from distraction, and helps all children reach their maximum learning potential. Restorative practices allows a student to understand their behavior, accept responsibility, and move toward improving their behavior. This year Turie T. Small is merging Restorative practice and PBIS both as tools to build life long strategies for success.

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

Kim Stevens is our school contact and works with the district to ensure the success of PBIS. All faculty and staff receive training in PBIS and support the program through daily practices including implementing the bulldog bark, bulldog bucks, and complimenting positive behaviors when noticed.

Hilton Garden Inn is one of T.T. Small's business partners. They donate incentives that recognize the hard work of faculty and students.

Teachers plan family information nights to provide strategies and resources for improving student achievement.

Our community involvement specialist Jennifer Robinson, academic coach, Yoder Milton and guidance counselor, Cherise Webb-Moore plan activities/events for faculty, parents, and students to engage in.

Part V: Budget

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