Orange City Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

Demographics

Principal: V IR Ginia Freeman A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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.

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

Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/orangecity/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	82%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

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.

All students learn at Orange City School, where CPR – Cooperation, Pride, and Respect – brings us to life and helps us to do our best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange City Elementary... where hard work opens doors to a brighter tomorrow.

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
Bynum, Charles	Principal	Lead the school in order to create a learning environment where all students can learn and thrive.
Morrison, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Support of teachers and students in order to achieve academic success.
Mack, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Provide instructional excellence to support student success.
Akins, Tonya	Teacher, K-12	Provide instructional excellence to support student success.
Cinkosky, Chelsea	Assistant Principal	Support the vision of the school in order to create a learning environment where all students can learn and thrive.
Hyde-Underhill, Rachele	Instructional Coach	Support of teachers and students in order to achieve academic success.
Turner, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Provide instructional excellence to support student success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, V IR Ginia Freeman A

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
560

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
9

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	79	90	97	94	79	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	71	23	24	16	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	28	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	3	2	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/19/2021

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	58	80	75	68	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	9	15	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
	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	2	0	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	58	80	75	68	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	9	15	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
	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	2	0	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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				45%	56%	57%	47%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				40%	56%	58%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	46%	53%	40%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				43%	59%	63%	46%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				43%	56%	62%	42%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	43%	51%	36%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	57%	53%	57%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	59%	-20%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For the English Language Arts and Mathematics sections the number represents the total number of students tested during the i-Ready window. Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring "Early On Grade Level" or "Mid or Above Grade Level" on the i-Ready diagnostic assessment.
For the Science section the number represents the total number of students tested. This number consists of more than one assessment. / Percent proficiency is percentage of students scoring 70% or above on the assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/15.79%	82/18.29%	87/43.68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/10.17%	64/15.63%	68/36.76%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0%	14/7.14%	12/8.33%
	English Language Learners	10/0%	12/8.33%	10/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/12.82%	80/26.25%	88/43.18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/9.84%	62/17.74%	70/37.14%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0%	12/8.33%	11/18.18%
	English Language Learners	12/0%	12/25%	10/26.53%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82/21.95%	93/34.41%	104/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/18.31%	80/30%	85/44.71%
	Students With Disabilities	12/25%	11/27.27%	12/25%
	English Language Learners	11/18.18%	13/23.08%	15/20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	78/7.69%	87/20.69%	91/34.07%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/7.46%	75/18.67%	74/33.78%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0%	11/9.09%	11/18.18%
	English Language Learners	11/0%	11/9.09%	14/21.43%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78/42.31%	87/52.87%	81/61.73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/40%	72/54.17%	66/59.09%
	Students With Disabilities	16/25%	17/29.41%	17/41.18%
	English Language Learners	9/33.33%	9/44.44%	8/50%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81/14.81%	83/24.10%	78/44.87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	67/14.93%	68/25%	63/42.86%
	Students With Disabilities	17/5.88%	15/26.67%	16/43.75%
	English Language Learners	10/10%	9/22.22%	8/37.50%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	73/31.51%	82/34.15%	86/41.86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/30.77%	73/31.51%	74/41.89%
	Students With Disabilities	17/11.76%	21/4.76%	22/27.27%
	English Language Learners	12/25%	14/35.71%	16/43.75%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72/11.11%	78/26.92%	79/46.84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/9.38%	69/24.64%	67/46.27%
	Students With Disabilities	17/5.88%	20/10%	19/26.32%
	English Language Learners	12/26.67%	14/14.29%	13/46/15%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69/26.76%	69/34.21%	69/34.52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59/27.87%	59/36.92%	59/34.25%
	Students With Disabilities	12/0%	13/0%	13/0%
	English Language Learners	15/6.67%	15/29.41%	15/33.33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70/12.86%	70/28.57%	63/49.21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/13.33%	60/28.33%	56/46.43%
	Students With Disabilities	12/0%	13/0%	12/0%
	English Language Learners	15/6.67%	15/33.33%	14/57.14%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	316/48%	251/56%	187/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	272/46%	219/53%	164/65%
	Students With Disabilities	47/11%	38/27%	29/50%
	English Language Learners	73/40%	57/29%	42/64%

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	22	15	20	16	17		8				
ELL	38	58		29	9		38				
BLK	24			33							
HSP	49	53		37	12		38				
WHT	48	50		40	37		52				
FRL	46	43	47	35	22	8	38				
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	16	37	35	9	28	32	26				
ELL	35	20		40	53						
BLK	19	29		19	21						
HSP	41	45		52	55		44				

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
WHT	48	38	33	43	43	36	54				
FRL	41	44	39	42	42	36	51				

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	10	29	27	18	41	33	18				
ELL	30	40	30	35	63	70					
BLK	23	23		27	15						
HSP	40	41	36	46	50	50	63				
MUL	38			38							
WHT	52	47	41	48	44	38	57				
FRL	45	44	40	46	43	31	54				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	39
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	29
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	41
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	45
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Math proficiency decreased from 3rd grade to 5th grade overall, and in our ESSA subgroups of SWD and African Americans. The trend is that math proficiency is low. Science achievement has decreased from 52% to 40% from 2019 to 2021. The trend for ELA is that students are making gains including our lowest quartile. There are also more students who are proficient.

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

Based on district assessments and the FSA state assessments for 2019 and 2021, the greatest need for improvement is math proficiency and math learning gains.

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

Our contributing factors that led to the need for improvement include students missing a quarter of the school year face to face and had to learn virtually using the ICP. Most of our students had a teacher change at least once throughout the 2020-2021 school year. Some students went from live to face to face teaching, back and forth. In addition, we had many adults and students on campus that had to quarantine due to covid, some more than once.
Support from academic coaches district resource teachers are needed to help plan and guide small group instruction. We are going to departmentalize in 4th and 5th grade so teachers can have a clear focus on two subject areas. Targeted intervention will happen during the math intervention block, with a possibility of having a walk to model to enrich and intervene. Grades 3-5 are going to incoorporate a math interactive notebook using AVID WICOR strategies.

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

The district assessment data and 2019/2021 FSA that showed the most improvement was ELA learning gains and lowest quartile.

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

Some contributing factors included the focus of small group instruction. We had two reading intervention teachers that pulled groups for targeted interventions daily, focusing on reading comprehension. One new action we did was we had an additional targeted intervention in the classroom using Ready Reading in all intermediate grades while other students worked on their learning path on iReady and/or SuccessMaker.

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

During math and ela intervention block, there will an enrichment group for all grade levels. Grade levels K-5 will have a walk to intervention model for reading. Math intervention groups will be targeted. Academic coaches will assist with planning intervention based on assessment data during PLC.

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.

Curriculum Dive with district resource teachers providing strategies to support science and math instruction. PST and Intervention professional learning will take place to ensure teachers are trained to provide research based interventions based on student need (Tier 2 and Tier 3). Collaborative Planning professional learning will continue school wide.

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

Collaborative Planning professional learning will continue school wide. Reading Walk to Intervention will continue in all grade levels to ensure students are receiving the support or enrichment needed to sustain or improve proficiency in the next year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1, to engage students in high levels of learning every day. According to FSA data from 2021 all areas in math assessment data decreased. Acheievement decreased from 43 to 39%. Math learning gains decreased from 43% to 25%. Math LQ decreased from 42% to 21%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math proficiency by 7% to match or exceed our 2017-2018 math achievement scores on the FSA.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by classroom learning walks, and collaborating during PLCs to discuss district assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Collective Teacher Efficacy. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie describes Collective Teacher Efficacy as the belief that teachers can more positively impact the learning of their students if they work as a team. This strategy has an effect size, according to John Hattie, of 1.57, which is the strategy with the highest effect size. Collective teacher efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	

The use of learning targets in every classroom to ensure that students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard, the lesson, and the task/assessment.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets, dicussing ideas for instruction, and reviewing student data to determine intervention/enrichment strategies.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The rationale on why we identified SWD as a critical need was due to the FSA data showing a decline in many of the areas including lowest quartile and learning gains. We are going to focus on our African American population as well as the SWD because the data showed a decrease in both ESSA subgroups.
Measurable Outcome:	All ESSA subgroups will meet or exceed the federal index of 41%.
Monitoring:	The area of focus will be monitered at our data driven PLCs with administration and academic coaches. In addition, our district resource teachers, MTSS resource teacher, and ESE teachers will provide support at PLCs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation embedded in instruction with Benchmark, enVision, Elevate, and Core Connections. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Building collective efficacy and collaboration with general education teachers, administration, coaches and support teachers. District provided resources, curriculum, and assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Include ESE, ESOL and Intervention teachers in PLC meetings every 6 weeks and Team Planning.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaching Cycles focused on Differentiation

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct quarterly data walks with administration, coaches, and teacher leaders.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Discipline data showed there were 144 suspensions out of 287 events on campus. This shows a need for a positive practice approach to discipline.
Measurable Outcome:	Suspensions will decrease from 144 suspensions to 125.
Monitoring:	Assistant principal will pull monthly discipline date to share at leadership meetings and PBIS leadership meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chelsea Cinkosky (clcinkos@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented is the use PBIS school wide for all students. This will be monitored through: Regularly checking the effectiveness of our practices, using data to monitor student progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy was due to the high amount of disciple referrals and suspensions. We are looking at using a proactive approach rather than a reactive approach to discipline. When implementing PBIS outcomes will consist of : Families, students, and school personnel set goals and work together to see them through, improved student behavior, and/or fewer office discipline referrals.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of the discipline flow chart and the behavior intervention tracking form to assist teachers in teacher managed behaviors versus administrative managed behaviors.

Person Responsible	Chelsea Cinkosky (clcinkos@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implementing a school wide SEL program, Sanford Harmony. This program is happening daily the first 20 minutes of every day. Special area teachers, ESE, ESOL, and Academic Coaches are in classrooms supporting grades K-2 during this time.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Positive incentives earned through Rocket buck system.

Person Responsible	Chelsea Cinkosky (clcinkos@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1, to engage students in high levels of learning every day. According to FSA data from 2021 only 46% of our students are proficient in the ELA standards. Achievement increased 1% from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency by 7% to reach 53% proficiency overall in ELA.
Monitoring:	This will be monitored by classroom learning walks and data based PLCs to discuss district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Collective Teacher Efficacy. We will monitor it through frequent walkthroughs by school-based administrations, coaches, and the district support team. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive feedback to guide them in planning and instructing for input on students' learning and determining next steps.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie describes Collective Teacher Efficacy as the belief that teachers can more positively impact the learning of their students if they work as a team. This strategy has an effect size, according to John Hattie, of 1.57, which is the strategy with the highest effect size. Collective teacher efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

The use of learning targets in every classroom to ensure that students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard, the lesson, and the task/assessment.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets, dicussing ideas for instruction, and reviewing student data to determine intervention/enrichment strategies.

Person Responsible	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@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.

After comparing our schools SESIR discipline data, our primary area of concern is hitting and striking an employee, as we had 23 incidents. Our secondary area of concern is hitting and striking with 82.
Our school plans to reduce these incidents by implementing the following:

School will:
-train teachers in PBIS
-create a common language for expectations for all areas of campus
-identify mentors for students with high incidents
-have monthly PBIS meetings to discuss discipline data and leadership team will share out with their teams

Teachers will:
-teach, model, implement PBIS expectations
-reward students for positive behavior
-follow discipline flow chart to determine behavior interventions

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.

Orange City Elementary invites the community members and local business owners to attend school-wide events. We intentionally encourage community members and business partners to participate on the School Advisory Council as well as the PTA. We invite city officials to speak personally to students and parents and to participate in school celebrations. River Springs Middle School visits annually to speak to rising sixth graders concerning preparation for the middle school transition. Orange City Elementary administration and support staff effectively communicate the needs of our school community to stake holders and partners. In that way, we are able to secure needed resources to support student achievement. Dixie Larsen, family center paraprofessional, helps to coordinate events for families and provide continuous support. This school year, we are implementing PBIS to increase positive behaviors on campus and take a positive proactive approach to discipline.

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

Community members and local business owner participation in schoolwide initiatives show that our neighborhood school and the social emotional learning as well as academic learning of our students is a priority to our community.
OCE Administration provides a supportive environment to teachers, staff, parents and students, so that learning is the priority at Orange City.
Coaches provide encouragement and contribute to the positive culture through academic supports and collaboration with admininstration, teachers, and staff.
PTA has a huge impact on our positive culture and environment through events such as Chalk the Walk, PTA Christmas shop, Movie Under the Stars, Trunk or Treat, Raised $1400 for students who could not afford to shop at the Book Fair. All of these events and contributions support our school environment and our students and families so that they feel welcome and part of the OCE family.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00