Palm Terrace Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Palm Terrace Elementary School

1825 DUNN AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/palmterrace/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Karen Troutman M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2019

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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (39%) 2017-18: D (33%) 2016-17: D (38%) 2015-16: D (38%) 2014-15: C (41%)
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	CS&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.

Table of Contents

Palm Terrace Elementary School

1825 DUNN AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/palmterrace/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	96%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	D	D	D	D

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

Mission Statement of Palm Terrace Elementary:
In an environment of mutual respect and trust, the students, staff, parents, and community of Palm Terrace Elementary School will actively share the responsibility of ensuring success for all children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision Statement of Palm Terrace Elementary: It is our belief that not only every child can learn, but that the faculty and staff at Palm Terrace Elementary will provide every opportunity to ensure the success of each student.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harris, Tucker	Principal	
Struska, Paul	Assistant Principal	
Margison, Antoinette	Instructional Coach	
Filer, Terranius	Teacher, K-12	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	98	93	95	118	80	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	14	27	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	28	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	12	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	4	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
59

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	16	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	9	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	1	20	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

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	33%	56%	57%	37%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	56%	58%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	46%	53%	47%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	35%	59%	63%	40%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	45%	56%	62%	37%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	43%	51%	29%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	57%	53%	31%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	98 (0)	93 (0)	95 (0)	118 (0)	80 (0)	90 (0)	574 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 ()	17 ()	14 ()	27 ()	18 ()	17 ()	106 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	8 (0)	8 (0)	26 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	26 (0)	28 (0)	56 (0)	110 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
	2018	28%	56%	-28%	57%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	54%	-24%	58%	-28%
	2018	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	36%	60%	-24%	62%	-26%
	2018	32%	58%	-26%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	28%	59%	-31%	64%	-36%
	2018	28%	60%	-32%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
	2018	31%	57%	-26%	61%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	56%	-25%	53%	-22%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	29	29	14	36	27	6				
ELL	18	30		27	60						
BLK	29	38	38	30	39	44	29				
HSP	28	53		25	63		30				
MUL	58	67		53	47		55				
WHT	41	56		49	56		38				
FRL	33	43	41	35	44	41	33				

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	3	23	29	10	32	29	14				
BLK	24	31	27	26	29	20	36				
HSP	17	22		28	57	70	55				
MUL	67	46		54	36						
WHT	38	43		38	30		60				
FRL	29	34	29	30	32	33	42				

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
				2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS							
SWD	10	31	30	13	28	30	18				
BLK	33	45	47	34	36	30	22				
HSP	30	44		33	38						
MUL	56	50		63	36						
WHT	45	52		54	40		47				
FRL	36	45	44	39	38	28	29				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	48
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

ELA showed the lowest proficiency. This cohort of students has demonstrated reading deficiencies indicating a lack of foundational reading skills. Additionally the fourth grade group of students included 16 transition students indicating historical low performance.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior assessment year. The 5th grade cohort showed a 3% decline in ELA and the 4th grade cohort showed a 4% decline in math.
These declines can be contributed to a lack of prerequisite skills and reading deficiencies.

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.

The greatest gap between PTE and the state average was found in 4th grade math. Contributing factors to this could be a lack of prerequisite skills and introduction of more rigorous components of standards.

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

ELA Learning grains of lowest quartile showed a 13% increase. Palm Terrace Elementary implemented targeting standards based intervention in ELA. This intervention was provided by the classroom teachers as well as interventionists. This intervention was data driven and focused on lowest quartile students in fourth and fifth grade.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

A reduction of discipline referrals is a focus for Palm Terrace Elementary for the 2019-2020 school year. The goal is that through the SEL TOA and the use of Sanford Harmony and intentional restorative practices discipline referrals will be reduced by 10%.

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

1. ELA achievement
2. Social Emotional Learning and reduction of discipline referrals
3. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Safe and Supportive Environment
Rationale	High level of discipline referrals resulting in out of school suspensions.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Reduce discipline referrals and out of school suspensions by 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	School Wide Social Emotional Learning Plan
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing a school wide social emotional learning plan with a focus on restorative practices will reduce discipline referrals and out of school suspensions which will maximize instructional time for all students. John Hattie's work with "Visible Learning" indicates that positive teacher-student relationships have a .72 effect size on student growth. This indicates a need to improve the use of preventative and restorative practices to increase the amount of time that students are in the classroom thereby increasing instructional time.

Action Step	
Description	1. Provide SEL training for teachers 2. Provide SEL curriculum (Sanford Harmony) for use in classrooms 3. SEL TOA to provide support to students and teachers in the implementation and follow up coaching This action step will be monitored through the use of logs indicating classroom calls, classroom observations, as well as monthly PBIS meetings that will allow all stakeholders to review data and discuss the effectiveness of the implementation of the SEL plan.
Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Science Achievement
Rationale	2018-2019 FSA Achievement (-10 points)

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Science Acheivement from 34% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention plan for students with learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hattie's research indicates a .77 effect size for providing interventions to students with identified learning needs. Through this standards based targeted intervention for identified students, it is expected that achievement will increase.

Action Step	
Description	1. Based on fair game standards develop a remediation plan 2. Monthly meetings with science specialist in order to plan lessons and review data 3. Academic interventionists will provide targeted daily intervention to fifth grade students with identified learning needs 4. Third and fourth grade teachers will receive coaching and support in order to deepen knowledge of science standards and improve science instruction 5. VST data will be monitored and analyzed 6. There will be a focus on science during PTE's Walks for Implementation focusing on target-task alignment and learning targets and success criteria.
Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	ELA Achievement
Rationale	2018-2019 FSA Achievement indicated a discrepancy between school performance and the district. ELA Achievement was 33% compared to the district of 56%, ELA learning gains were 44% compared to the district of 56%, and lowest quartile students scored 42% compared to the district of 46%. This achievement gap indicates a strong need to focus on ELA achievement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA achievement from 33% to 38%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Differentiated instruction through the use of collaborative structures
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By increasing engagement (Hattie's effect size .6) student achievement will increase.

Action Step	
Description	1. Professional learning on differentiated instruction 2. Professional learning on target and task alignment 3. Professional learning on learning targets and success criteria 3. Structured planning time to focus on instructional practices including differentiated instruction 4. Increase planning time to focus on L25 and ESSA groups 5. Continued data review within team led PLC
Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

N/A

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Communications are sent to all stakeholders on school events and accomplishments. Some of this communication includes Connect Ed calls, announcements on the marquee, updating the school's website with upcoming events. Additionally, the school has created a school FaceBook page to reach a wider range of parents and to keep all stakeholders informed of events and ensure that everyone has the opportunity to participate.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Counseling, mentoring and social emotional learning support is provided. A school based Social Emotional Learning Teacher on assignment provides specific social skills lessons in the classroom. Two behavior specialists are on campus in order to provide support to both ESE and Gen. Ed. students on an individual and group basis.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

District provides transitional support through the use of on campus orientation meetings as well as receiving school's welcome programs.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Through PLC and PST meetings the needs of students is evaluated using data and personnel (intervention teachers, support teachers) are then allocated to best meet the needs of the students. Some of the methods that are employed include targeted standards based intervention, SEL lessons and support. Additionally, monthly PBIS meetings occur to discuss and develop strategic plans to address school wide behavior needs.
ESE SF teachers meet weekly in order to discuss students needs and progress and to ensure that all components of the IEP are being followed and students are making adequate progress toward IEP goals.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Safe and Supportive Environment				$0.00
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Science Achievement**				**$321,651.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	6400	312-Subagreements greater than $25,000	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$321,651.00
			Notes: Consultants to provide, professional learning, weekly coaching for teachers including establishing classroom conditions and routines supportive of rigorous teaching and learning, effective functions of PLCs focused on student evidence of learning, cognitive engagement in rigorous tasks aligned to academic standards, integrated tech tools to measure growth			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$321,651.00**