Volusia County Schools

Port Orange Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Dyer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2019

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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (73%)
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.

Table of Contents

Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE, Port Orange, FL 32127

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/portorange/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	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	B

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.

We, the Port Orange Tigers, inspire each other to learn, grow, and strive for excellence each day!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that all students will reach high levels of learning through the commitment of our school community. We collaborate to implement and monitor a highly rigorous learning environment by assessing student learning and responding to meet the needs of every 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
Polite, Angela	Principal	To implement and model the Florida Principal Leadership Standards at Port Orange Elementary.
Williams, Margaret	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Mrs. Williams serves as the Special Area team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Williams represents the Special Area instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Alfonso, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Alfonso serves as the kidergarten team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Alfonso represents the kindergarten instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Rossi, Charlene	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Rossi serves as the academic coach for grades kindergarten through 5. Mrs. Rossi facilitates instructional pacing and practices for all grade levels. Mrs. Rossi provides a K-5 vantage point for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Fagerstrom, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Fagerstrom serves as the 5th grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Fagerstrom represents the 5th grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Powell, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Daffin serves as the 1st grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Daffin represents the 1st grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Sparks, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Sparks serves as the 2nd grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Sparks represents the 2nd grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Woodard, Reva	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Woodard serves as the 3rd grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Woodard represents the 3rd grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Duguay, Michele	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Duguay serves as the Assistant Principal and school based liason for instructional and daily campus operations. Mrs. Duguay is an administrative representative for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.

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	65	59	55	60	86	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	11	5	7	11	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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)

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

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	8	6	6	8	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	24	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	4	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	70%	56%	57%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	53%	44%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	59%	63%	66%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	56%	62%	50%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	43%	51%	41%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	57%	53%	67%	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	65 (0)	59 (0)	55 (0)	60 (0)	86 (0)	73 (0)	398 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	11 ()	5 ()	7 ()	11 ()	19 ()	11 ()	64 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	2 ()	3 ()	7 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	16 ()	25 ()	43 (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	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	59%	-2%	64%	-7%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	60%	4%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	40	58	60	21	55						

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
HSP	62	56		55	63						
MUL	74	82		58	45						
WHT	71	65	60	65	66	45	58				
FRL	64	59	50	54	55	33	55				

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	15	54	55	25	38						
HSP	56			33							
MUL	54			31							
WHT	62	57	44	57	59	42	67				
FRL	54	53	48	46	53	37	55				

2017 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	15			15							
MUL	64			73							
WHT	61	52	46	64	47	41	66				
FRL	50	47	44	56	43	40	60				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
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	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
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	61
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	53
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.

Our SWD's math achievement proficiency rate of 21% evidenced our lowest performance component.The SWD math proficiency rate of 21% evidenced a 4% decrease from the 2017-2018 FSA data. 6% of our students in grades Kindergarten through 5 are identified as a SWD. Students with disabilities in the testing grade levels represent a small portion of the overall testing group. The lack of differentiated tier one instruction and targeted tier 2 and 3 support to include a consist cycle of instruction, formative assessing and the direct response to outcomes was a contributing factor to low performance.

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

Science achievement evidenced an overall 5% decline in achievement. The science achievement disaggregated by subgroup evidenced a 9% decrease in the white subgroup population and a 0% change in the economically disadvantaged subgroup population. It is hypothesized that Kindergarten through 4th grade science instruction lacked consistent standards based science instruction. This led to significant academic deficits in science standards only taught in grades 3rd and 4th, as well as the foundational science standards taught in Kindergarten through 2nd grade. 5th grade science instruction also lacked cyclical components to include targeted formative assessments.

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 ELA Achievement evidences a 7 percentage point gap above the state average. Math Achievement evidences an 8 percentage point gap under the state average. The school-wide focus on targeted instruction improved the overall level of proficiency in ELA. Our math data demonstrates a need to intensify the quality of math instruction. Due to focused planning in the development of the master schedule, there is time for focused differentiated instruction on a daily basis. The focus on developing teacher proficiency with the depth of the math standards

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

Overall Math achievement evidenced an 11% increase.The 17-18 53% math achievement was equal to a school grade of C. The 18-19 math achievement of 64% is equal to a school grade of A. Four of the five subgroup populations evidenced an increase in the percent proficient ranging from 8% to 27%.

During the 18-19 school year, the master schedule was developed to include strategic intervention

blocks to support differentiated instruction. PLC's focused on targeted small group instruction. Tutoring was used to support school based instructional delivery tasks. The use of i-Ready, provided teachers will data points specifically details students areas where proficiency was lacking.

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

1. Attendance below 90%
2. Level 1 on State Assessment

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

1. Science Achievement
2. Math Lower Quartile Learning Gains
3. ELA Lower Quartile Learning Gains
4. Student's with Disabilities
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Science Proficiency
Rationale	Science Achievement was identified as an area of focus based on multiple years of data evidencing a downward trend in proficiency. The percentage of students in grade 5 demonstrating proficiency has decreased 19% over the last 5 years. The percentage of students scoring level 1 has increased 10% over the past 5 years.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	80% of students will demonstrate mastery on the state standardized science summative assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Daily science instruction focused on standards with a clear aligment between learning targets and learning tasks in grades K-5. Common formative assessments in grades 3-5. Administration of district assessments in grades 3-5 Timely analysis of the 3rd-5th VST and SMT assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students are assessed annually in grade 5 for standards that are taught in grades 3rd through 5th. After careful analysis of all summative data points and the review of K-5 instructional practices to include both school-based and district input, the aforementioned strategies were identified. Data sources: VST 1-4 FSA Classroom Observational evidence PLC agenda and minutes
Action Step	
Description	1.Pace and plan weekly instruction in PLC/Team Planning session 2. Bi-weekly walkthroughs of K-5 science instructional block with specific look fors 3. Feedback given via weekly Tiger Times bulletin and PLC 4. VSET Observational evidence 5. Implementation of Common experiments grades K-5 6. Targeted Professional learning differentiated based on need
Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Lowest Quartile
Rationale	The percetage of students in the lower quarterile demonstrating a learning gain is 35%. Subgroup performance data specific to math lower quartile evidences learning gains ranging from 33% to 45%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% or greater of students in the lower quartile will demonstrate a learning gain as measured by the 2019-2020 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Pacing and planning of instruction in grade level teams Bi-weekly math instructional block classroom walkthroughs for evidence collection of the on stage elements of the instructional cycle. Targeted PLC topics and focus based on current student performance data and classroom instructional observations Common formative assessments Administration of District Assessments Analysis of all summative data to guide tier 1,2 and 3 instruction PLC re-structure process
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students in the lower quartile are underperforming in math as evidenced by formative and summative data. Faculty feedback reveals a need for ongoing professional learning in the area of math instructional practice and knowledge of standards.
Action Step	
Description	1.Pace and plan weekly instruction in PLC/Team Planning session 2. Bi-weekly walkthroughs of K-5math instructional block with specific look fors 3. Feedback given via weekly Tiger Times bulletin and PLC 4. VSET Observational evidence 5. Implementation of rigorous tier 1 math instruction 6. Targeted Professional learning differentiated based on need
Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Science Proficiency**	**$0.00**

2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Math Lowest Quartile**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**