Palm Terrace Elementary School

2021-22 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: 2/16/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* 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.](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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%

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	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

The community of Palm Terrace Elementary will make a positive difference in the lives of the students and families we serve but creating an environment of clear and high expectations where student and family voice is the norm. We we accelerate learning and increase student achievement by providing access to strong instruction, deep engagement, and grade level assignments.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Filer, Terranius	Teacher, K-12	Coaches: Support classroom teachers by planning, observing, providing feedback, and providing/supporting resources. Monitoring i-Ready data and assisting with diagnostic set ups. Set up and monitoring of data wall with data cards. Principal: Monitor data of district assessments, facilitate PLC, determine schedules and structures of campus, classroom observations providing feedback to teachers, VSET, Celebrations of student successes, supervision, discipline Assistant Principals: Master schedule, safety and security, facilities, Instructional Review/SIP management, manage funds of grants, Accreditation, Discipline, Monitor lowest quartile student data and learning gains data, VSET, facilitate PD, Textbooks, Celebrations of student successes, supervision, classroom observations and provide feedback to teachers
Jordan, Angel	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Team Lead
Lewandowski, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade Team Lead
Masters, Kimberly	Math Coach	
Swinton, Krysta	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Team Lead
Warmoth, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Team Lead
Cobb, Corrine	Assistant Principal	
Elliott, Stefanie	Teacher, K-12	Administrative Teacher on Assignment
Schmitt, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	Special Area Team Lead
Feaster, Corynne	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead
Margison, Antoinette	Reading Coach	
Troutman, Karen	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 2/16/2018, Karen Troutman 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.*

3

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

572

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

7

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

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	98	90	104	96	52	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	77	32	31	25	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	14	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	10	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	15	7	4	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	10	8	33	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	1	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	96	82	116	96	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	20	37	13	29	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	4	3	2	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	40	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	48	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	2	4	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	9	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	96	82	116	96	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	20	37	13	29	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	4	3	2	4	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	40	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	38	48	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	3	2	4	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	9	1	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				33%	56%	57%	29%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	56%	58%	33%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	46%	53%	29%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				35%	59%	63%	31%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				45%	56%	62%	33%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	43%	51%	32%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	57%	53%	43%	58%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
05	2021					
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	36%	60%	-24%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	28%	59%	-31%	64%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	31%	56%	-25%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grade 1- ELA- VLT 1, 2, and 3 and iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3/ Math iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3
Grade 2- ELA VLT1, 2, and 3 and iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3/ Math iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3
Grade 3- ELA VLT 1, 2, and 3, and iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3/ Math iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3
Grade 4- ELA VLT 1, 2, and 3, and iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3/ Math iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3
Grade 5- ELA VLT 1, 2, and 3, and iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3/ Math iReady Diagnostic 1, 2, and 3
ELA data below includes VLT/iReady diagnostic

Additional Data:
Grades 3-5 Math SMT 1 (for these grade levels math data below includes SMT 1/iReady diagnostic)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	82/12.2%	93/27.96%	100/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	80/12.5%	89/26.97%	94/46.81%
	Students With Disabilities	13/30.77%	13/38.46%	17/47.06%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/9.33%	88/14.77%	94/39.36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/9.59%	84/14.29%	87/39.08%
	Students With Disabilities	13/23.08%	12/16.67%	14/42.86%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/30.18%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/13.89%	79/21.52%	91/26.37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/12.68%	76/21.05%	86/25.58%
	Students With Disabilities	19 /10.53%	21 /4.76%	23/ 0.00%
	English Language Learners	3/ 0.00%	3/ 0.00%	3/ 0.00%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/4.29%	81/12.35%	71/25.35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	69/4.35%	78/12.82%	66/27.27%
	Students With Disabilities	19/0%	21/0%	19/10.53%
	English Language Learners	3/ 0.00%	3/ 0.00%	3/ 0.00%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69 /30.43%	67/ 38.81%	75/ 46.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67 /28.36%	64/ 37.50%	72 /45.83%
	Students With Disabilities	12 /8.33%	13/ 15.38%	13/ 23.08%
	English Language Learners	6/16.67%	6 /16.67%	6 /50.00%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67/10.45%	68/22.06%	70/41.43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/9.23%	65/20.00%	67/40.30%
	Students With Disabilities	12/8.33%	13/7.69%	13/15.38%
	English Language Learners	6/0.00%	6/0.00%	6/16.67%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89 /14.61%	99/ 25.25%	95 /18.95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	85/ 15.29%	94 /26.60%	89 /20.22%
	Students With Disabilities	18/ 0.00%	16/ 0.00%	19/ 0.00%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	89/5.62%	96/21.88%	87/32.18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	85/5.88%	92/21.74%	80/33.75%
	Students With Disabilities	17/0%	16/ 0.00%	18/0.00%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	86/26.74%	88/32.58%	89/40.66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	85/26.06%	84/31.76%%	81/42.17%
	Students With Disabilities	15/0%	16/0%	14/0%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/100%	1/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85/17.65%	89/26.97%	92/45.65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	83/16.87%%	84/27.38%	83/46.99%
	Students With Disabilities	14/0%%	16/0%	14/14.29%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	1/100%	1/100%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	300/44%	314/52%	214/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	294/43%	299/54%	200/65%
	Students With Disabilities	47/14%	43/36%	28/44%
	English Language Learners	5/100%	4/100%	3/100%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	40		11	35	30	25				
ELL											
BLK	33	43	50	33	34	23	46				
HSP	21			21							
MUL	38			47							
WHT	47			67							
FRL	34	42	47	36	36	28	47				
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				

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	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				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	70
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	37
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	21
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	43
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	57
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 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?

There is an overall trend of growth across grade levels and content areas. In ELA, third grade had a 19% increase of tier 1 students from iReady diagnostic 1 to iReady diagnostic 3. This grade level also demonstrated consistent growth among all three diagnostic assessments. Additionally, in math, third grade demonstrated a 31% increase in tier 1 students from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3, and also showed consistent growth among all three assessments.
Fifth grade students also demonstrated consistent growth across ELA and Math and consistent performance in Science. For ELA, there was a 13% increase in tier 1 students and math showed a 28% increase in this tier. Science assessment scores remained fairy consistent across VST 1, 2, and 3 with proficiency rates The levels of proficiency are still below district and state proficiency expectations. Rising third grade and rising fifth grade students show greater discrepancies in both ELA and Math.

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

Data shows that improvement is needed in ELA and Math proficiency. Although science scores were near proficiency it will be necessary to focus on increasing student achievement in this area as well.

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

There were many contributing factors that led to this need for improvement. There are the results of instructional loss due to Covid 19, through school closure in the 2019-2020 school year, students remaining on virtual instruction for the first half of the 2020-2021 school year, and quarantines due to positive cases. In addition to these factors, students at Palm Terrace have been working hard to overcome large gaps in their learning. Some students are performing one to two grade levels below in ELA and/or Math. The work has been great at Palm Terrace Elementary but there are still areas to improve upon. One of the greatest leverage actions that will be take for the 2021-2022 school year will be increasing teacher and student voice and ownership. The goal of this is to take instruction to the next level in a deliberate and targeted way. Continued specific and actionable feedback will be utilized in order to improve teacher efficacy.

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

-Science Achievement increased by 13 points.
-PTES increased their percent proficient by 6% from 2019 to 2021.
-This was the 4th highest increase in the school district.
-Palm Terrace was one of only 16 schools in the district to increase in Science Achievement.
-ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains increase by 5 points.
-Palm Terrace was one of only 18 schools in the district to increase ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
-Increased 1 point in ELA and Math Achievement.
-One of only 14 schools in the district to increase ELA Achievement.
-One of only 7 schools in the district to increase Math Achievement.
-Palm Terrace maintained their overall total percent of possible points.

-One of two schools in the district who maintained their total percent of possible points.
-33 schools in the district decreased their overall total percent of possible points.
-5th grade ELA % proficient increased 11% from 2019 to 2021.
-3rd grade Math % proficient increased 9% from 2019 to 2021.
-3rd grade ELA % proficient increased 2% from 2019 to 2021.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement were a laser like focus on planning and implementation. Immediate, targeted feedback addressing areas of focus. This allowed for teachers to take immediate action to refine and improve instruction.

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

Acceleration of learning will take a multifaceted approach. Palm Terrace Elementary will work to increase teacher and student voice. The first step of this will be a clear picture of student data. Teacher will be having frequent data meetings both as PLC groups and with their students. The intention of this will be to ensure that every stakeholder has a deep understanding of the data and what that means for the student instructionally. Palm Terrace Elementary will be utilizing data notebooks in grades K-5 and students as well as teachers will own the data.
The use of this data will aid in acceleration of learning in that, we will know exactly what benchmarks and standards students need support in, and which they have a good grasp on. This will make instruction more targeted, specific, and will increase the pace in which we are able to minimize learning gaps.
Palm Terrace Elementary will also be implementing AVID in grades 3-5. These personal development and instructional strategies will help students to organize their learning, to see their progress and successes along the way, and motivate them to keep working towards success.

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.

During pre-planning teachers participated in Diversity and Equity Training. Additionally TNTP presented the Opportunity Myth 2.0. In partner with TNTP teachers and leaders with participate in Teacher Like a Champion 2.0. These trainings will take place during four early release Wednesdays.

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

-Continued focus on lesson planning, preparation, and implementation.
-Immediate actionable feedback
-Support of collaborative planning by specifically identified knowledgeable others
-Targeted coaching cycles
-Team leads leads will be with TNTP to build leadership capacity

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it was revealed that our ELA proficiency was 34% and our ELA learning gains were 43%, and lowest quartile showed 47%. The data indicates a continued need for improvement. In addition our ESSA subgroup data indicated that SWD ELA LG were 40% and ELA LQ were 44%. This same group demonstrated 11% math proficiency, 35% Math LG, and 30% math LQ LG. African American students' scores are as follows: ELA Achievement 33%, ELA LG 43%, ELA LQ LG 50%, Math Achievement 33%, Math LG 34%, Math LQ 23%, and Science Achievement 46%.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year Palm Terrace Elementary will increase ELA overall proficiency from 34% to 50% in order to focus on ESSA subgroup; African American, and SWD. Palm Terrace will increase ELA learning gains on FSA from 43 to 50%.
Monitoring:	- Weekly review of lesson plans with administrative feedback provided and coaching as needed - Utilize formalized classroom look for documents to provide specific actionable feedback to improve instruction - Formal and informal coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data including iReady, District assessment data, progress monitoring as well as disaggregating ESSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus on teacher clarity (Hattie effect size .75); Planning, preparation, and delivery of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers are clear in the expectation and instruction, students learn more. Teacher clarity is teaching that is organized and intentional. This weekly strategic planning is clear and allows teachers to develop a deep understanding of the standards and the strategies and steps needed to work towards student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

- Analyze baseline data (FSA, iReady, District Assessments, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)

Person Responsible	Antoinette Margison (amargiso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Professional learning in Teacher Clarity with a focus on lesson planning and preparation

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Weekly review of lesson plans with administrative feedback provided and coaching as needed

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Utilize formalized classroom look for documents to provide specific actionable feedback to improve instruction

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Formal and informal coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data

Person Responsible Antoinette Margison (amargiso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- PLCs will be data driven and focused on improving student achievement through teacher clarity

Person Responsible Antoinette Margison (amargiso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Monthly pacing and planning meetings with intervention and ESE teachers to align benchmarks to instruction to ensure acceleration and remediation.

Person Responsible Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it was revealed that our Math proficiency was 36% and our Math learning gains were 37%, and lowest quartile scored 37% . The data indicates a continued need for improvement. In addition our ESSA subgroup data In addition our ESSA subgroup data indicated that SWD ELA LG were 40% and ELA LQ were 44%. This same group demonstrated 11% math proficiency, 35% Math LG, and 30% math LQ LG. African American students' scores are as follows: ELA Achievement 33%, ELA LG 43%, ELA LQ LG 50%, Math Achievement 33%, Math LG 34%, Math LQ 23%, and Science Achievement 46%.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, Palm Terrace Elementary will increase Math proficiency from 36% to 50% on FSA.
Monitoring:	- Weekly review of lesson plans with administrative feedback provided and coaching as needed - Utilize formalized classroom look for documents to provide specific actionable feedback to improve instruction - Formal and informal coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data including iReady, District assessment data, progress monitoring as well as disaggregating ESSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus on teacher clarity (Hattie effect size .75); Planning, preparation, and delivery of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers are clear in the expectation and instruction, students learn more. Teacher clarity is teaching that is organized and intentional. This weekly strategic planning is clear and allows teachers to develop a deep understanding of the standards and the strategies and steps needed to work towards student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

- Analyze baseline data (FSA, iReady, District Assessments, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)

Person Responsible	Kimberly Masters (kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Professional learning in Teacher Clarity with a focus on lesson planning and preparation

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Weekly review of lesson plans with administrative feedback provided and coaching as needed

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Utilize formalized classroom look for documents to provide specific actionable feedback to improve instruction

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Formal and informal coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data

Person Responsible   Kimberly Masters (kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- PLCs will be data driven and focused on improving student achievement through teacher clarity

Person Responsible   Kimberly Masters (kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Monthly pacing and planning meetings with intervention and ESE teachers to align benchmarks to instruction to ensure acceleration and remediation.

Person Responsible   Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Needs Assessment and Analysis revealed that our Science proficiency was 47%. The data indicates a large increase in achievement however, there continues to be a need for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year Palm Terrace elementary will Increase Science Proficiency from 47% to 50%.
Monitoring:	- Weekly review of lesson plans with administrative feedback provided and coaching as needed - Utilize formalized classroom look for documents to provide specific actionable feedback to improve instruction - Formal and informal coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data including iReady, District assessment data, progress monitoring as well as disaggregating ESSA data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Focus on teacher clarity (Hattie effect size .75); Planning, preparation, and delivery of instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers are clear in the expectation and instruction, students learn more. Teacher clarity is teaching that is organized and intentional. This weekly strategic planning is clear and allows teachers to develop a deep understanding of the standards and the strategies and steps needed to work towards student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

- Analyze baseline data (FSA, iReady, District Assessments, Ongoing Progress Monitoring)

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Professional learning in Teacher Clarity with a focus on lesson planning and preparation

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Weekly review of lesson plans with administrative feedback provided and coaching as needed

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Utilize formalized classroom look for documents to provide specific actionable feedback to improve instruction

Person Responsible	Tucker Harris (tharris@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Formal and informal coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data

Person Responsible	Antoinette Margison (amargiso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- PLCs will be data driven and focused on improving student achievement through teacher clarity

Person Responsible Antoinette Margison (amargiso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

- Additionally teams will collaborate to plan common experiments

Person Responsible Joseph Lewandowski (jplewand@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When compared with other elementary schools around the state, data shows that PTE has a higher rate of threats and fights. Considering that data, PTE will focus on reducing the amount of threats and fights. To address these issues we will continue to focus on social and emotional learning and development. In order to accomplish this, we will have an SEL TOA and Behavior Specialist on campus that will support restorative practices, meet with small groups of students to proactively build social and emotional regulation skills. The behavior specialist will also meet with individual students when behavior challenges arise in the classroom. The intention being, to minimize lost instructional time by having the student return to class as soon as possible, equipped with new and productive strategies in dealing with the situation that arose.
In addition, support and training will be provided to teachers in order to ensure that everyone is delivering the same high quality SEL instruction. All of these components combined with will enable students to better articulate their needs and express emotions, so the opportunity for escalation can be minimized. This will also enable the students' message to be received in the spirit in which is was intended and help to build a true culture of learning and acceptance.
The work of the SEL TOA and Behavior specialist will be monitored through the use of call logs and schedules, as well as informal check ins. It will also be evident in the reduction of these situations and the minimization of students out of classrooms due to behavior challenges, threats, and fights. Instead, PTE will be a calm place where students come to learn and thrive.

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.

All stakeholders at Palm Terrace Elementary are committed to creating an environment where students are valued, respected, and provided belief in themselves to realize their potential.

The Principal works tirelessly to secure business partners that meet the needs of the school in ways such as, donations of backpacks filled with school supplies, uniforms, and funds for special incentives for the students.
Palm Terrace has a long standing relationship with local colleges and universities in order to provide opportunities for interns to come and learn from the teachers and students, often these interns return to give back and teach at Palm Terrace.

Constant communication is in place through the use of teacher contact and Administrative Connect Ed calls. Monthly PTA and SAC meetings are offered in order to ensure that all voices are heard and to work towards building an even stronger school community.

From the first face families see; the front desk Office Specialist to the classroom teachers, and administration each person seeks to make the families feel welcomed and valued. At Palm Terrace Elementary each person views all of the students as "our kids" and works each day to communicate worth and high expectations. Each team member is invested and will stop at nothing to ensure that each student has a chance of winning.

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

-Administrative team sets the example and precedent for positive student interaction. They also provide behavior support and assign corrective measures as well as incentives and rewards.
-Behavior specialists support Gen Ed and students with disabilities to provide restorative practices and build social
-SEL TOA supports students through special area rotations, class meetings, and individual student support
-All teachers provide daily encouragement and instruction in social emotional learning to ensure that each day is positive and that each student has every opportunity to succeed

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$195,186.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$51,000.00
			Notes: Intervention Teacher to focus on Lowest Quartile ELA			
	5100	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$5,518.00
			Notes: Retirement @ 10.82%			
	5100	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$3,902.00
			Notes: Social Security @ 7.65%			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	230-Group Insurance	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$34.00
			Notes: Insurance @ .066%			
	5100	230-Group Insurance	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$5,853.00
			Notes: Insurance @ $5,853			
	5100	240-Workers Compensation	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$765.00
			Notes: Workers Compensation @ 1.5%			
	5900	120-Classroom Teachers	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$22,500.00
			Notes: Tutoring ($30 x 25 teachers x 30hours)			
	5900	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$2,435.00
			Notes: Tutoring Retirement @ 10.82%			
	5900	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,721.00
			Notes: Tutoring Social Security @ 7.65%			
	6300	110-Administrators	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$2,800.00
			Notes: AP Summer Planning (1AP x $35 x 10hrs x 8 days)			
	6300	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$303.00
			Notes: AP Retirement @ 10.82%			
	6300	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$214.00
			Notes: AP Social Security @ 7.65%			
	6400	312-Subagreements greater than $25,000	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$98,141.00
			Notes: Contracted Services - TNTP			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$10,663.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$3,000.00
			Notes: Teacher On Assignment data review and planning (1 x $30 x 10hrs x 10 days)			
	6300	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$325.00
			Notes: TOA Retirement @ 10.82%			
	6300	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$230.00
			Notes: TOA Social Security @ 7.65%			

	6300	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$6,000.00
		Notes: Coaches data review and planning (2 x $30 x 10hrs x 10 days)				
	6300	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$649.00
		Notes: Coaches Retirement @ 10.82%				
	6300	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$459.00
		Notes: Coaches Social Security @ 7.65%				
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$32,374.75**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$12,304.00
		Notes: Instructional Leader Supplements ($1,538 x 8 Teachers)				
	6300	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,331.00
		Notes: Instructional Leader Supplement Retirement @ 10.82%				
	6300	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$941.00
		Notes: Instructional Leader Social Security @ 7.65%				
	6400	510-Supplies	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$4,370.75
		Notes: Materials and Supplies for Professional Development				
	6300	120-Classroom Teachers	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$11,250.00
		Notes: Teacher Guided Planning (25T x $25 x 18hrs)				
	6300	210-Retirement	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$1,217.00
		Notes: Guided Planning Retirement @ 10.82%				
	6300	220-Social Security	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$861.00
		Notes: Guided Planning Social Security @ 7.65%				
	6400	390-Other Purchased Services	2451 - Palm Terrace Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	$100.00
		Notes: Printing - Focus board printing materials				
					Total:	$252,248.75