

Volusia County Schools

Coronado Beach Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Coronado Beach Elementary School

3550 MICHIGAN AVE, New Smyrna Beach, FL 32169

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

Demographics

Principal: Leigh Prokop M

Start Date for this Principal: 9/15/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (68%) 2020-21: (65%) 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Through focused collaboration , the teachers, faculty and staff of Coronado Beach Elementary School will work together to encourage best practices around academics, behavior, and citizenship resulting in academic success, and a positive impact on achievement for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Coronado Beach Elementary, we strive to educate all students as we enable them to reach and expand their best potential. We promise to provide a quality education which will prepare them to become successful, productive, responsible, and compassionate members of society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Prokop, Leigh	Principal	Liason that facilitates monthly meetings, and reports information back to faculty and staff.
Bartley, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Scalo, Jenifer	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Cloer, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Mullins, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Sokerka, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Canfield, Jessica	Guidance Counselor	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Quigley, Kim	Instructional Coach	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Wendt, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members
Ostrum, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Liason for grade level that attends monthly meetings, and reports information back to designated team members

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/15/2021, Leigh Prokop M

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

221

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	34	40	29	48	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	4	10	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/18/2022

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	32	35	49	31	35	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	12	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	32	35	49	31	35	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	12	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%			78%			76%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%			58%			70%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						44%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	77%			70%			78%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	81%			46%			71%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						47%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	84%			75%			79%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	82%	58%	24%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	81%	60%	21%	62%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	59%	9%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	84%	54%	30%	60%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	56%	23%	53%	26%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	33	57	50	43	57						
WHT	76	63	44	78	81	53	84				
FRL	67	70	55	64	79		81				
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	25			44							
WHT	81	67		72	56		73				
FRL	74			65			70				
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	33	30		42	64						
HSP	75			67							
WHT	78	73	50	82	72	50	81				
FRL	64	68	45	64	65	50	77				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
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 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	68
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	69
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 FSA, our percentage of proficient students in ELA decreased 2% from the previous year, and stayed the same from two years prior. ELA learning gains increased by 6%, however the learning gains of our students in the lower quartile decreased by 23 percentage points. In the area of Math, according to FSA, our achievement increased by 7%, and our learning gains improved by 35 percentage points. In the area of science, our achievement increased by 9 percentage points, resulting in 84% of our students showing proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

When analyzing student data, through student cohort groups, our area that shows the most need for improvement is ELA achievement and ELA learning gains. Our ELA achievement decreased by 2 percentage points, and our learning gains decreased by 23 percentage points. When looking at district assessment data in the area of ELA, our students produced an average of 69.4% proficiency which puts us in the "approaching proficiency" area of the proficiency scale.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

When analyzing notes, and data from PLC meetings, and visibility walk through data, there is evidence of a need for intentional planning for our WIN time (What I need; formally Walk-to intervention), which includes analyzing data and utilizing district approved resources. Additionally, there is evidence of a need for integration of student voice, and student collaboration, and increased feedback related to posted learning intentions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to progress monitoring data and 2022 state assessments, the area where we showed the most improvement was in mathematics, specifically mathematics learning gains. Our learning gains improved by 35 percentage points resulting in 81% of our students making learning gains.

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

Walkthrough data shows focused small groups occurring during both math small group instruction and math intervention/enrichment time. This was made possible by utilizing a "all hands on deck" approach. The instructional coach was added as a support person during the math intervention block so that

classroom teachers and ESE support facilitators could work with smaller, more focused groups aligned to specific student needs.

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

The strategies that will be implemented to accelerate learning start with the master schedule. Our master schedule reflects the opportunity for vertical planning to occur in the departmentalized classes. This allows more support providers to assist during WIN time, and during small group instruction. Smaller, focused groups will result in increased differentiated instruction and providing enrichment for our students that are performing above proficiency.

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.

Professional Development opportunities will include collaboration, planning and training opportunities with curriculum associates for ELA, Science collaboration to create standards aligned opportunities for outdoor learning with our district science specialists, Math support and training with our math specialist, and textbook representative, SEL focused PD with our school counselor, and opportunities to dive into real time data and respond to student needs during small group, intervention and enrichment time.

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

Our vertical planning master schedule set up mentioned above will provide intermediate grade levels to gain the instructional support of the instructional coach, the media specialist, and the ESE Support Facilitation team. Additionally, our special area rotation now includes our school counselor for increased SEL support, and our media specialist with a goal of providing more time with literature, book check out and Media standards that are integrated with the BEST standards in ELA.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our area of focus is aligned to the district strategic plan goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it was revealed that 76% of our students reached proficiency in ELA, which was a 2% drop from the previous year. Further analysis showed that the learning gains of our ELA lowest quartile students were 44%, a 23 point drop from the 18-19 SY. (Due to the cancellation of testing in the 19-20 SY, and the fact that our 5th graders tested in the 21-22 SY did not have previous assessment history, we did not have enough students to create an LQ Group. All LQ data was deemed blank and our school grade was created based on only 5 components.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal will be to increase the percentage of lower quartile students reaching proficiency from 44% to 55%, including our students with disabilities. Our rationale for including this specific group of students in the measurable outcome, is due to the fact that our lower quartile gains dropped 23 points from the year previous. Additionally, our students with disabilities federal index is at 42, which is 2 points away from becoming an official ESSA Subgroup.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of focus for the desired outcome will be monitored through i-Ready diagnostic assessments, Benchmark Unit Assessments, and State Progress Monitoring data. These data pieces will be all considered for planning and instructional support during meaningful weekly PLC's and coaching sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Quigley (kaquigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence based strategy being implemented will be small group instruction. Small group support will be available for all grade levels whether it be through instructional support and coaching from the instructional coach, as well as small group support in ELA from the Media Specialist, and ESE support facilitation team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Small group instruction is grounded in the research of John Hattie. Hattie's research shows that the effect size of small group instruction is .47 which is beyond the hinge point of .40 for positive effects on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Differentiated instruction- additional support during WIN (What I Need) time. This will allow students to truly get what they need according to ongoing progress monitoring through the use of Benchmark Advance weekly and unit assessments, EARLY STAR Literacy , STAR Reading, FAST Cambium assessments, and i-Ready diagnostics. Our vertical planning model allows multiple teachers at a small school with only one teacher per grade level to analyze data, and group students for small group instruction/reading comprehension regularly and with fluidity.

Collaborative planning- We will use vertical planning, common planning for our ESE team, and a new question table format for PLC's to guide rich data driven discussions that are led by student data.

Our school counselor will meet with LQ/bubble kids weekly to review study skills and goal planning.

We will design and facilitate PD on standards based learning, ensuring instruction is aligned to the rigor of the strands, and BEST benchmarks, Achievement Level Descriptors and Released Test Item Specifications.

There will be Instructional coaching on planning for alignment to standard as well as questioning and deepening rigor in whole group and small group instruction.

We will hold weekly MTSS leadership team meetings led by our MTSS chair to review current data, and discuss supporting teachers through providing MTSS tiered support for students in need.

Person Responsible Leigh Prokop (lprokop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our area of focus is aligned to the district strategic plan goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our needs assessment and analysis, it was revealed that 77% of our students reached proficiency in Math. Further analysis showed that the learning gains of our Math lowest quartile students was 53%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal will be to increase the percentage of lower quartile students reaching proficiency from 53% to 60%, including our students with disabilities. Our rationale for including this specific group of students in the measurable outcome, is due to the fact that our students with disabilities federal index is at 42, which is 2 points away from becoming an official ESSA Subgroup.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The area of focus for the desired outcome will be monitored through i-Ready diagnostic assessments, Big Ideas Math Chapter tests, and State Progress Monitoring data. These data pieces will be all considered for planning and instructional support during meaningful weekly PLC's and coaching sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Quigley (kaquigle@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The evidence based strategy being implemented will be small group instruction. Small group support will be available for all grade levels whether it be through instructional support and coaching from the instructional coach, as well as small group support in Math from the instructional coach, and ESE support facilitation team.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Small group instruction is grounded in the research of John Hattie. Hattie's research shows that the effect size of small group instruction is .47 which is beyond the hinge point of .40 for positive effects on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Differentiated instruction- additional support during small group math. Analysis of data from Big Ideas Math Chapter Tests, FAST Math Progress Monitoring Assessments, Power BI data dashboard, and i-Ready diagnostics. The instructional coach and support facilitators will provide support by pushing into classrooms for the last 30 minutes of the math block 4 days per week to assist with Big Ideas Practice, reteaching and/or enrichment/extend activities.

Collaborative planning- Vertical planning, common planning for our ESE team, and a new question table format for PLC's to guide rich data driven discussions that are led by student data.

Our school counselor will meet with LQ/bubble kids weekly to review study skills and goal planning.

PD on standards based learning, ensuring instruction is aligned to the rigor of the strands, and BEST benchmarks, Achievement Level Descriptors and Released Test Item Specifications.

There will be Instructional coaching on planning for alignment to BEST math Strands and benchmarks as well recognizing horizontal and vertical progressions within the strands and benchmarks.

We will hold weekly MTSS leadership team meetings led by our MTSS chair to review current data, and discuss supporting teachers through providing MTSS tiered support for students in need.

In depth data analysis pertaining to the use of Reflex and Frax and the effects on student performance in NOS strands and FR strands will continue. Monthly challenges to encourage use of Frax and Reflex at home will continue.

Person Responsible Leigh Prokop (Improkop@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**Area of Focus
Description and****Rationale:
Include a rationale
that explains how
it was identified as
a critical need
from the data
reviewed.**

This area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a healthy, safe and supportive environment. Student behaviors resulting in referrals have shown a slight increase. Additionally, our number of our of school suspensions has increased among our students with disabilities. This has resulted in a need for increased support from behavior specialists and other district staff members.

**Measurable
Outcome:
State the specific
measurable
outcome the
school plans to
achieve. This
should be a data
based, objective
outcome.**

During the 2021-22 School Year, 31.58% of VCS schools indicated an ineffective core behavioral and instruction fidelity. An effective core was indicated at a rate of 68.42%. Our school site Benchmarks of Quality survey indicates that we have an effective core rate of 79%. We will utilize our PBIS implementation checklist data and benchmarks of Quality data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing referrals and suspensions of students within subgroups. Our measurable outcome is:
Coronado Beach Elementary will increase our effective core rating according to the Benchmarks of Quality Document from 79% to 90%.

**Monitoring:
Describe how this
Area of Focus will
be monitored for
the desired
outcome.**

The area of focus will be monitored quarterly through implementation checklists, and Benchmarks of Quality surveys. Additionally, Monthly PBIS meetings will be held where data is pulled, and the PBIS team will collaborate to improve the PBIS implementation, and school environment if needed.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Jessica Canfield (jkcanfie@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:
Describe the
evidence-based
strategy being
implemented for
this Area of
Focus.**

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a multi-disciplinary approach through district wide MTSS framework. Outcomes will be measured and monitored. Office Discipline Referrals will be monitored by the district MTSS planning team, and by the school based PBIS leadership team on a monthly basis. Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the PBIS District coordinator, Dr. Mandy Ellzey, following the close of the reporting windows for fall and spring reporting and the year end. This data will also be monitored by the PBIS teams to be used for progress monitoring and planning.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting this
specific strategy.
Describe the
resources/criteria
used for selecting
this strategy.**

PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making. Based upon research, the PBIS Implementation Checklist is a quick checklist to assess the degree of implementation for actively implementing schools. It gives teams a sense of what has-been-done and what needs-to-be-done in the PBIS implementation process. The Benchmarks of Quality survey is intended to guide both initial implementation and sustained use of PBIS Tier 1. Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). These assessments contains 53-items divided into ten critical elements that make up an effective PBIS Tier 1 system. Completion of the BoQ produces scale and subscale scores indicating the extent to which these critical elements are in place.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

As a new tier 1 PBIS school, we were trained in summer of 2022. Active schools monitor 2021-22 implementation data and outcome data to identify goals for 2022-23 SY

Professional Learning through ERPL's on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures.

Monthly PBIS PLC's closely follow Positive Behavioral Interventions

Monthly monitoring of student discipline and observation data.

Fall-Complete PBIS implementation checklist

Spring-Complete PBIS implementation checklist

End of the Year: Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory.

In addition to our formalized PBIS implementation, we have also created our master schedule so that our school counselor has the opportunity to provide weekly guidance lessons with small groups of students, we are continuing our "cookies with the counselor" program that recognizes students who exhibit the character trait of the month. Furthermore, our school counselor will also be holding data chats with our LQ students.

Person**Responsible**

Kimberly Williams (kawillia@volusia.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step**Person Responsible for Monitoring**

The RAISE program is not applicable to Coronado Beach Elementary.

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Schoolwide SEL instruction that is embedded within the ELA curriculum

Schoolwide SEL instruction on the weekly special area schedule.

PBIS implementation with incentives for both staff and students.

Student Voice groups

Pizza with the Principal weekly.

Informing stakeholders of school wide themes, events etc. via social media and school website-

Positive Referral System

Pirate of the Month

Teacher Shoutouts-

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

All teachers will be responsible for implementing SEL instruction on a daily basis as integrated in ELA curriculum. Our School Counselor will be responsible for delivering weekly SEL lessons to all classes during their special area time.

Ms. Williams, Assistant Principal and Mrs. Prokop, Principal will be responsible for implementation and reinforcement of PBIS cafeteria expectations.

Mrs. Prokop, school principal will be responsible for facilitating student voice groups, pizza with the principal and supporting the Pirate of the month staff incentive program.

Mrs. Jessica Canfield, our school counselor and designated DLT will be responsible for informing stakeholders of schoolwide themes, events, etc. via social media.

Mr. Booher, our school bookkeeper will be responsible for keeping our school website updated so that community members and other stakeholders are informed of our events that promote positive culture.

All Faculty and staff will have the ability to recognize both students and each other by providing Pirate Bucks, Goldblooms, and positive referrals when a student is caught displaying positive behaviors or actions.

Our PBIS leadership team will hold monthly meetings where all teachers and staff have the opportunity to attend and provide feedback and input on strengthening our schoolwide PBIS system.

Mrs. Prokop, Principal, Ms. Williams, Assistant Principal and Ms. Quigley, Instructional coach will be responsible for celebrating students academic excellence within the classrooms.

Our sunshine club will be responsible for celebrating birthdays, special occasions, or life events of teachers and staff.

Our School Theme "Education is the Passport to Success" will be incorporated in various ways.