

Volusia County Schools

Woodward Avenue 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Woodward Avenue Elementary School

1201 S WOODWARD AVE, Deland, FL 32720

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

Demographics

Principal: Carlos Scott M

Start Date for this Principal: 1/4/2017

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)	73%
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 (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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

We believe each child is special. We guide our students to love learning, cooperate with each other, and respect themselves and others.

Provide the school's vision statement

Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Scott, Carlos	Principal	Instructional Leader Monitor school-wide student achievement Curriculum Contact Financial Audits Professional Learning Community Lead Lead Collaborator Contact School Calendar & Events Contact School Improvement Plan Contact Re-Entry Meeting Team Member Threat Assessment Team Member Security Manual and Security Audit Teacher Evaluations Title I Budget and Audits FTE Audits Master Schedule Lead
Hayden, Cicely	Administrative Support	ESE Administrator Discipline Office Co-Lead (Process Referrals) In-School Suspension Coordinator After-Hours Security Contact Attendance for All Initiative co-coordinator Bloodborne Pathogens Contact Free-Reduced Lunch Contact (with Mrs. Baker) Lead Collaborator Team Member Red Ribbon Week Contact Re-Entry Meeting Team Member Schoolwide Discipline Team Member School Leadership Team Member Security Team Member Student Transportation Contact & Referrals Textbook Inventory Contact Threat Assessment Team Member
Hall, Darnell	Teacher, K-12	Music Teacher Teach standards-aligned music instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Tutoring Facilitator
Lucero, Lisa	Teacher, ESE	Assist with administering district assessments, common assessments, and progress-monitoring ESE students Coordinate and attend all IEP meetings Conference with Gen Ed teachers to write and revise IEP goals Provide intervention and remediation instruction to support mastery of standards Utilize resources and materials that will best support the needs of ESE students Provide assignments and tasks to students that are aligned to their needs

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vick, Kirsten	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students
Bastow, Laura	Guidance Counselor	Attend meetings with administration and academic coaches to review data and PST instructional plans Facilitate SEL/Mental Health training for faculty and staff Provide social skills lessons to individuals, groups, and classes of students Attend IEP Meetings Coordinate and facilitate Re-Entry meetings/plans for students Schedule and facilitate meetings to provide support and ensure PST/504 plans are developed, updated, and followed
Goble, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students
Ledet, Jeanene	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students
Woodward, Penny	Teacher, K-12	Teach standards-aligned instruction daily Ensure lesson activities/tasks are aligned to standards taught Administer district assessments and common assessments Meet with grade-level teams during PLCs to review data/plan instruction Provide intervention, remediation, and enrichment support to monitor the progress of students
McFall-Conte, Michelle	Assistant Principal	VSET Evaluator After hours security contact (2) AM Daily Superviision Curriculum Maps and Lesson Plans contact Discipline

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		DSPC Main Contact eLearning contact ESOL Supervisor Lead Collaborator Team Member School City Contact

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/4/2017, Carlos Scott M

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

52

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)	73%
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 (49%)

	2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	0	99	106	112	100	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	534
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	9	12	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	9	12	21	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	2	5	12	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/3/2020

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	92	103	111	100	110	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	19	17	17	22	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	9	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	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	92	103	111	100	110	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	19	17	17	22	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	9	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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		3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	49%	56%	57%	50%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	56%	58%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	53%	29%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	53%	59%	63%	59%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	55%	56%	62%	51%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	43%	51%	33%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	50%	57%	53%	58%	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	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	54%	-9%	58%	-13%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	59%	-3%	64%	-8%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	60%	-15%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	22	43	47	18	43	47	19				
ELL	27	24	15	30	48	64	47				
BLK	33	51	56	38	52	33	30				
HSP	38	30	8	47	53	50	45				
MUL	50			56							
WHT	59	53	43	61	57	53	62				
FRL	41	42	42	45	53	48	43				

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	11	24	22	21	32	32	32				
ELL	25	40	27	50	71						
BLK	32	31	18	43	47	30	30				
HSP	44	50	31	60	56		50				
MUL	53	60		44	45						
WHT	57	53	41	66	51	41	66				
FRL	43	44	27	54	52	36	50				

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	49
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	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	395
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	41
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	53
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	55
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	46
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

The area that showed the lowest performance, according to iReady diagnostic data was in the area of math, especially for the grade levels of 2nd grade and fourth grade. Another low performance was 3rd grade ELA that dropped from 70% to 46% showing movement toward typical growth; along with 5th grade ELA that dropped from 75% achieving typical growth down to 10% of fifth grade students achieving their typical growth. Another area that was low performance was 5th grade science SMT scores that showed just 16.50% achieved satisfactory for SMT2.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was math iReady and 5th grade science. In science, last year's 5th graders just had 16.50% of their students score satisfactory. This group, that was in 4th grade for the 18-19 school year had 80% showing satisfactory on the 4th grade SMT2.

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

According to FSA data from 2019, our Students with Disabilities subgroup had 34% of students achieve satisfactory on the 2019 FSA assessment. Also, on the same assessment, 38% of Woodward's ELL students scored satisfactory on the 2019 FSA assessment.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement 4th grade ELA. On iReady diagnostic 1 for ELA, 32% of 4th graders scored their typical growth. On diagnostic 2, 75% of fourth grade students achieved their typical growth.

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

When looking at EWS Data, there are two potential areas of concern. The first is students with one or more suspensions. That total (minus the 5th graders that went to middle school) was 91 students (17% of our students). A second concern is the number of

students that had an attendance rate below 90%. According to EWS, 73 students had an attendance rate below 90%) Another concern on EWS are students with 2 or more indicators which is 51 (minus the fifth graders who went to middle school).

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

1. SEL
2. Math Achievement
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA Achievement
5. Achievement of Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The percentage of second graders achieving typical growth on the iReady diagnostic math assessment decreased from 50% to 40%. The percentage of 5th graders achieving typical growth from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 2 dropped from 33% to 22%.

Measurable Outcome: FSA Math Achievement will increase, for third grade, from 55% achieving a level 3 or above on FSA to 60%. FSA Math Achievement will increase for fourth grade from 56% to 61% scoring a level 3 or above. In 5th grade, FSA Math Achievement will increase from 45% scoring a three or above to 50%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increasing knowledge and understanding of standards aligned instruction through increased small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The effect size of small group instruction is 0.79, which is almost two years growth. T

Action Steps to Implement

Increase the Implementation of Number Talks through training the teacher who have never been trained in Number Talks.

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

use of standard mathematical vocabulary through the use of coaching cycles and PLC's

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District led math learning walksto assess the implementation of Number Talks and Standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Support by academic coach with planning and data analysis during PLC's

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data Chats between teachers and students, and between teachers and administration.

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: On the 2019 FSSA, Woodward's FSSA score dropped 8 points from 58% scoring a level 3 or above to 50% of students scoring a level 3 or above.

Measureable Outcome: The percentage of 5th grade students scoring satisfactory on FSSA will increase from 50% to 60% of students scoring a level 3 or above.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Using Data to remediate science standards

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small group instruction carries an effect size of 0.79, which is almost 2 years growth. Science programs carry an effect size of 0.56, which is over one year's growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher will develop knowledge, through training, of vertical tracing, and imbedding fair game science standards.

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Science Based Learning Walks to ensure science instruction that is aligned to standards

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaching Cycles with identified teachers

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teacher/Student Data Chats and Teacher/Administration Data chats

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The total number of discipline referrals for the 19-20 school years was 654. The total number of in school suspensions for the 19-20 school year was 118. The total number of out of school suspensions for the 19-20 school year was 252.

Measureable Outcome: The total number of discipline referrals for the 20-21 school year will decrease 20% from 654 to 524. The total number of in school suspensions for the 20-21 school year will decrease 20% from 118 to 95. The total number of out of school suspensions will decrease 20% from 252 to 202.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle McFall-Conte (mamcfal1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Feedback, Progress Monitoring, Procedure Implementation and Incentives

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Hattie's effect sizes, suspending or expelling students has a negative effect size of -0.20. Social skills programs have an effect size of 0.37, which is almost one year's growth. Motivational programs have an effect size of 0.35, which is almost one year's growth in students. Concentration/persistence/engagement have an effect size of 0.54, which is over one year's growth.,

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will be trained in a School wide Behavioral Incentive System, and will implement in their classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers and Staff will be trained on the Implementation of House System, and how to implement the system with students in their class.

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementation of Mentorship program

Person Responsible Carlos Scott (cmscott@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.

Improvement in ELA Achievement especially with our Students' with Disabilities and ELL students is an area of focus the Leadership team will continue to address The School Leadership Team will address this priority through learning walks, PLC meetings, etc.

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.

Meet the teacher, Open house, during and after school activities, and parent student surveys are all components in establishing and maintaining positive relationships between teachers, students, families, and community members.

The District Migrant Education Program (Title I, part C) provides the following programs for students at Woodward who are eligible:

Academic assistance through tutoring, and summer school, translation service for parent conferences, parental support for parent/student activity nights, and food/medical assistance through referrals to outside agencies. Through Title III, ESOL teachers are provided with ongoing support and professional development to make sure best practices are being implemented. ESOL teachers are consistently monitoring the progress of ELL students to identify specific needs. Woodward works closely with the Title X Coordinator to make sure homeless students have the materials and resources they need to be successful.

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: Instructional Practice: Math				\$21,120.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			1491 - Woodward Avenue Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$1,800.00
			<i>Notes: Substitute teachers so lead teachers are able to participate in learning walks to observe classrooms. This includes math, science, ELA, and SEL activities.</i>			
			1491 - Woodward Avenue Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$19,320.00
			<i>Notes: Collaborative Planning Days for teachers to plan common lessons and assessments in math, ELA, science, etc.</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$1,200.00

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	0000	140-Substitute Teachers	1491 - Woodward Avenue Elem. School	Title, I Part A		\$1,200.00	
			<i>Notes: Data Chats twice a year to discuss student progress in math, ELA, science, and SEL/behavior.</i>				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning					\$0.00
					Total:	\$22,320.00	