Volusia County Schools

Port Orange Elementary School

2021-22 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: 6/9/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* 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%)
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.

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)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

School Grades History

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

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining to Special Area teachers.
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.
Rossi, Charlene	Instructional Coach	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, assessment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Daffin, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	Support new teachers to the school.
Busse, Debra	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining to Grades K and 1.
Philon-Myrtil, Jasmine	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining to Counseling.
Dyer, Kati	Principal	To implement and model the Florida Principal Leadership Standards at Port Orange Elementary and to serve as a School Leadership Team member overseeing issues related to implementation of the SIP.
Sparks, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member, with the role of ensuring House System alignment to SIP.
Tyner, Feryl	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member, with the role of ensuring support for Grades 2 and 3 teachers.
McComb, Anna	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team Member and AVID site team lead.
Clowers, Abigail	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair and SLT member.
Berg-Brown, Mimi	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair and SLT member.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/9/2021, Kathryn Dyer

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.*

19

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

315

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

5

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

5

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	45	49	49	65	54	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	6	11	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	10	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	1	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	34	45	52	39	42	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277
Attendance below 90 percent	17	4	4	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	34	45	52	39	42	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277
Attendance below 90 percent	17	4	4	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				70%	56%	57%	62%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	56%	58%	58%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	46%	53%	45%	39%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	59%	63%	53%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	56%	62%	55%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	43%	51%	33%	40%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	57%	53%	64%	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	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	59%	-2%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

ELA and Math: iReady
Science: local science assessments (topic checks and volusia science tests)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	48/39.58%	50/50%	50/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/37.84%	38/50%	39/71.79%
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	2/50%	2/100%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	48/20.83%	51/54.90%	50/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37/16.22%	38/47.37%	38/84.21%
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	2/50%	2/50%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA/54.05%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	57/50.88%	63/50.79%	71/71.42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/43.90%	47/44.68%	52/69.23%
	Students With Disabilities	5/20%	5/0%	8/50%
	English Language Learners	NA	1/0%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	53/22.64%	63/42.86%	67/58.21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38/10.53%	44/43.18%	49/59.18%
	Students With Disabilities	5/20%	6/33.33%	8/25%
	English Language Learners	NA	1/0%	2/0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	44/63.64%	44/68.18%	52/73.08%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/62.50%	32/65.63%	63/75%
	Students With Disabilities	3/0%	4/0%	6/33.33%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/50%	3/33.33%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	43/23.26%	40/45%	48/58.33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32/15.63%	31/35.48%	35/60%
	Students With Disabilities	3/0%	2/50%	4/0%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/50%	3/33.33%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	38/52.63%	42/59.52%	48/66.67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/42.86%	32/50%	35/60%
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	3/33.33%	3/33.33%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	3/0%	3/0%
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	37/29.73%	42/47.62%	43/72.09%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/18.52%	32/34.38%	32/65.63%
	Students With Disabilities	2/0%	3/0%	4/0%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	3/33.33%	3/33.33%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76/51.32%	76/62.34%	77/71.79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/40.82%	49/50%	50/66%
	Students With Disabilities	8/25%	8/22.22%	8/25%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	3/66.67%	3/66.67%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75/45.33%	77/57.14%	79/74.68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/37.50%	50/48%	52/69.23%
	Students With Disabilities	8/12.50%	9/0	10/20%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	3/66.67%	3/66.67%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	285/68%	286/82%	151/92%
	Economically Disadvantaged	181/67%	185/83%	98/92%
	Students With Disabilities	26/29%	27/71%	15/88%
	English Language Learners	7/50%	10/33%	6/67%

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	18			9							
HSP	82			82							
MUL	67			75							
WHT	67	53	38	69	70	57	73				
FRL	60	50	46	65	62	50	73				
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						
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				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
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	
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	82
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	71
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	58
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?

Lower ELA and Math achievement in 3rd grade than other grades
Higher proficiency rates in science
Increases in math proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile as compared to years prior, as well as ELA

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

Lower ELA and Math achievement in 3rd grade than other grades
ELA Learning Gains, and ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest Quartile

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

3rd grade team had some instability in staffing due to combined grade levels due to COVID; difficulty in maintaining consistency with students.
3rd and 4th grade teams are beginning right away with interventions for students; 3rd grade team is displaying portfolio progress so that students can monitor their progress and needs.

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

Science Achievement showed the highest gains (18% increase), Math Lowest Quartile (15% increase) showed the next highest gains, and Math Achievement showed the next highest gains (7% increase).

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

Science:
Extra planning with district science support
ISN-student interactive
Tutoring for identified students
Departmentalization for 5th grade, with teacher dedicated to Science

Math:
PLC focus
Dedicated math intervention time
Pacing and planning standards during PLC

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

Pacing and Planning with Teams with ELA focus, especially for implementing new Benchmark series.
Support for teachers with New Curriculum and standards (teacher learning walks, PLC)
Increasing student ownership (Goal setting, Student notebooks, success criteria)
Tutoring, pre-teaching
Planning time with Science Contact

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.

Date Time Topic
Aug. 10, 2021 Pre-planning 7:45-9:45 SIP Overview, Teacher Clarity Review
Aug. 11, 2021 Pre-planning Benchmark Advance, Curriculum Overview
Aug. 11, 2021 Pre-planning 11:15-2:15 Canvas self-paced trainings
Aug. 12, 2021 Pre-planning 7:45-8:45 Safety & Security, VSET Training, DOJ Training
Aug. 13, 2021 Pre-planning 10:00-11:00 1st Day Proc., Arrival/Dismissal, Grade Level Expectations
Aug. 25, 2021 ERPL#1 (School) 2:00-4:00 Increasing Student Ownership through AVID (Philosophy, Connection to Assessment-Capable Learners, and Goal Setting)
Sept. 9, 2021 Faculty Meeting 2:45-3:45 PST
Sept. 20, 2021 PL Day 7:30-3:00 Meeting the Diverse Needs of Students with Autism; PLCs
Sept. 29, 2021 ERPL#2 (District) 2:00-4:00 Clarity for All Learners: Using Data to Attend to our Achievement Gaps
Oct. 18, 2021 TDD 8:30-11:30 Planning & Pacing
Oct. 20, 2021 ERPL#3 (School) 2:00-4:00 Supporting Teacher Clarity Using Benchmark Advance Resources
Oct. 27, 2021 ERPL#4 (District) 2:00-4:00 Autism Spectrum: Profile of Environments, Curriculum, and Teaching Supports (ASPECTS)
Nov. 4, 2021 Faculty Meeting 2:45-3:45 Using Panorama Resources to Support Adult & Student SEL Needs
Nov. 10, 2021 ERPL#5 (School) 2:00-4:00 Connections Between Teacher Clarity & Danielson
Dec. 1, 2021 ERPL#6 (District) 2:00-4:00 Oracle Phase II
Dec. 17, 2021 TDD 8:30-11:30 Planning/Pacing
Jan. 13, 2022 Faculty Meeting 2:45-3:45 Success Criteria Unconference
Jan. 26, 2022 ERPL#7 (District) 2:00-4:00 Diversity
Feb. 10, 2022 Faculty Meeting 2:45-3:45 TBD
Feb. 16, 2022 ERPL#8 (School) 2:00-4:00 Clarity for All Learners: Using Data to Attend to Achievement Gaps
March 3, 2022 Faculty Meeting 2:45-3:45 AVID Strategies Unconference
March 11, 2022 TDD 8:30-11:30 Planning & Pacing

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

In order to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond, we will focus on strengthening teacher knowledge and teacher leadership through PLCs and teacher-led committees. A strong focus on core instruction will help ensure that fewer students have need for interventions. In addition, we know we must attend to our special kindergarten population this year. Because so many of our kindergarten students stayed at home last year due to COVID, we have many students with no preschool experience. Focusing improvement efforts on kindergarten students now will help to ensure that these gaps are closed early.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage ALL students in learning every day. In order for students to make a learning gain, they need to understand what they are learning and be invested in their educational growth. Our needs assessment and analysis revealed that our ELA learning gains were 54% and Math learning gains were 68%. Our Lowest Quartile learning gains for ELA were 40% and Math were 50%. ELA Learning Gains for SWD were 33% and for African American, 0%. Math Learning Gains for SWD were 20% and for African American, 0%.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will make a learning gain in iReady reading and math. FSA: ELA LG increase from 54% to 70%, Math increase from 68% to 75% ELA LQ from 40% to 62%, Math from 50% to 65% Subgroup LG and LQ will be 50% or higher. Students will be able to answer the questions: What am I learning? Why am I learning? How will I know when I get there? (How does this apply to my future learning.)
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with specific student engagement look-fors. Data chats in PLCs will also serve to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. In addition, coaching cycles will be conducted based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data. Persons Responsible – Principal Kati Dyer and Coach Charlene Rossi. Walk-throughs: Percent of students -1st quarter-approaching 50% on 2/3 questions Percent of students - 2nd quarter-50% or higher 2/3 Percent of students-3rd quarter 50% or higher 3/3 Percent of students-4th quarter 75% or higher on 3/3
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Teacher Clarity, specifically with a focus on creating Assessment Capable Learners. 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:	Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 and Assessment Capable Learners has an effect size of 1.33 (Hattie). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to

students; and
• provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with the entire faculty and staff, the data the SLT examined that determined the need for implementation of Teacher Clarity.

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs.

Person Responsible Charlene Rossi (cprossi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use Learning Targets and Success Criteria to ensure students know what they are learning.

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Train teachers to implement goal setting with students.

Person Responsible Charlene Rossi (cprossi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use schoolwide House System to provide positive behavior incentive system for students who are able to answer clarity questions effectively.

Person Responsible Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct walkthroughs to determine where to implement coaching cycles based on teacher need as demonstrated through weekly classroom observations and student performance data.

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work, to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

Person Responsible Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teams will engage in ongoing teacher clarity work during faculty meetings and integrate the following questions into their discussions: Where are we going? Where are we now? How do we move learning forward? What did we learn today? Who benefitted and who did not?

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLCs focused on identifying learning targets/intentions, discuss ideas for instruction, review student work, determine students who need additional instruction or intervention to be successful.

Person Responsible Charlene Rossi (cprossi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order for students to become Assessment Capable Learners who take ownership of their learning, they must also be skilled in emotional regulation. Our Panorama Survey revealed that 41% of students are proficient at self-regulation and 51% rated themselves as engaged in their learning. Our needs assessment and analysis revealed that ELA Proficiency was 68%, Math Proficiency was 71%, and Science Proficiency was 77%. Learning Gains for ELA were 54% and 40% for the Lowest Quartile in ELA. Learning Gains for Math were 68% and 50% for the Lowest Quartile in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	The Panorama survey will show 61% for self-regulation and 71% for engagement. This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with academic and SEL goal look-fors. Persons Responsible - Assistant Principal Michele Duguay.
Monitoring:	Walk-throughs: Percent of students - 1st quarter-approaching 50% on 2/3 questions Percent of students - 2nd quarter-50% or higher 2/3 Percent of students - 3rd quarter 50% or higher 3/3 Percent of students - 4th quarter 75% or higher on 3/3
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is Social Emotional Learning. This strategy will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with academic and SEL goal look-fors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Wallace Foundation, "social and emotional skills are essential to learning and life outcomes. Furthermore, research indicates that high-quality, evidence-based programs and policies that promote these skills among students can improve physical and mental wellbeing, academic outcomes, and college and career readiness and success" (Navigating SEL from the Inside Out, 2021).

Action Steps to Implement

Share with entire faculty and staff the connection between an Assessment Capable Learner's acadmic skill and social emotional regulation.

Person Responsible	Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing training for teachers and students based on the Panorama survey around the areas of Adult and Student SEL.

Person Responsible	Jasmine Philon-Myrtil (jjphilon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Buddy Walks with students focused on look-fors of Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria and the three questions: What are you learning? Why are you learning it? How will you know when you've learned it?

Person Responsible	Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Work with students to set SEL goals.

Person Responsible Jasmine Philon-Myrtil (jjphilon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use schoolwide House System to provide a positive behavior incentive system for students with an SEL focus, especially relating to schoolwide Essential 25.

Person Responsible Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct walkthroughs to ask students questions related to academic and SEL goals they have set.

Person Responsible Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus aligns to Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage ALL students in learning every day. In order for students to become Assessment Capable Learners, teachers must first have clarity about what will be taught. Our needs assessment and analysis revealed that ELA Proficiency was 68%, Math Proficiency was 71%, and Science Proficiency was 77%. Learning Gains for ELA were 54% and 40% for the Lowest Quartile in ELA. Learning Gains for Math were 68% and 50% for the Lowest Quartile in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will make a learning gain in iReady reading and math. FSA: ELA LG increase from 54% to 70%, Math increase from 68% to 75% ELA LQ from 40% to 62%, Math from 50% to 65% Subgroup LG and LQ will be 50% or higher. Students will be able to answer the questions: What am I learning? Why am I learning? How will I know when I get there? (How does this apply to my future learning.)
Monitoring:	This Area of Focus will be monitored through frequent classroom observations using a walkthrough tool with collaborative planning look-fors. Data chats in PLCs will also serve to determine instructional adjustments needed to impact student growth. Persons Responsible – Principal Kati Dyer and Coach Charlene Rossi. Walk-throughs: Percent of students -1st quarter-approaching 50% on 2/3 questions Percent of students - 2nd quarter-50% or higher 2/3 Percent of students-3rd quarter 50% or higher 3/3 Percent of students-4th quarter 75% or higher on 3/3
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence-based strategy is collaborative planning, especially through PLCs. We will implement PLCs weekly, except when holidays/black out weeks present conflicts. Grade level teams and individual teachers will analyze standards to plan effectively and use data to guide in determining intervention/enrichment needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative Planning will help teachers to increase Teacher Clarity, which is a necessary foundation for students to become Assessment Capable Learners. Teacher Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 and Assessment Capable Learners has an effect size of 1.33 (Hattie). The average affect size is 0.40, which is equal to approximately one year of learning. At 0.75, it is likely that the impact on students is significantly greater than average when teacher clarity is implemented with fidelity. John Hattie describes teacher clarity and excellent teachers as those who: • have appropriately high expectations. • share their notions of success criteria with their students. • ensure that there is constructive alignment between the lesson, the task, and the assignment. • ensure that the delivery of the lesson is relevant, accurate, and comprehensible to students; and • provide welcome feedback about where to move to next.

Action Steps to Implement

Share with faculty and staff how collaborative planning will increase teacher and student clarity.

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing support for collaborative planning in PLCs and Planning/Pacing Days on Teacher Duty Days. This collaborative planning time will focus on identifying learning targets/intentions, discussing ideas for instruction, reviewing student work, and/or determining students who need additional instruction, intervention, or enrichment. Collaborative planning will include planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks.

Person Responsible Charlene Rossi (cprossi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Provide ongoing professional learning in Teacher Clarity during ERPLs and Teacher Duty Day.

Person Responsible Charlene Rossi (cprossi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Learning Walks with teachers focused on look-fors of Learning Targets/Learning Intentions and Success Criteria and the three questions: What are you learning? Why are you learning it? How will you know when you've learned it?

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Work with PLCs to set goals as a PLC team.

Person Responsible Charlene Rossi (cprossi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use schoolwide House System to provide a positive behavior incentive system for teachers for collaborating with one another and supporting one another's growth.

Person Responsible Michele Duguay (mlduguay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct walkthroughs to identify and celebrate evidence of collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Kati Dyer (kbdyer@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.

In comparison to our district and state, Port Orange is considered at low risk. We will continue to monitor threat assessment and discipline data in order to ensure that our numbers remain low and that any needed interventions are provided.

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.

The Port Orange Elementary will implement a school-wide House System. The POE House System will serve as the foundation of our school to include school-wide expectations. House members to include students and staff will establish house traditions, collaborate for house initiatives and form strong bonds to support our school's academic, social and community goals.

For all students, our school counselor is providing monthly classroom SEL lessons and our school Media Specialist will be conducting digital citizenship lessons. For tier 2 (SEL), we are targeting a selected group of students to receive mentoring from teachers.

If permitted and if appropriate, we will host Family Nights and parent engagement activities. Activities will be modified when not appropriate to host on-site events for families and community. Port Orange Elementary is fortunate to have a partnership with local businesses and churches, as well as a community food-pantry organization called Provision Packs.

Taken together, these initiatives and partnerships combine to provide a positive school culture for all and resources to assist those in need.

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

Administration works with teacher committees to support and facilitate activities and opportunities that will promote a positive culture and environment at POE.

Teachers and staff serve on committees (AVID Site Team, School Leadership Team, House Council), each with different emphases, but all with the shared goal of improving and enhancing what we offer for students at POE.

Students are each assigned a House, and we ensure that all students follow a common set of expectations that are designed to promote a positive culture and environment. Nominated students also serve on News Crew, Kindergarten Ambassadors, and Safety Patrol--activities that are designed to foster leadership skills and provide role models for others of positive contributors to the school community.

Parents, volunteers, and community members serve on PTA and SAC. In these roles they help to ensure

that our communication with parents is effective and they also help to recognize faculty and staff for their positive contribution to the school.

<div style="background-color:#1f2f6f; color:white; text-align:center; font-weight:bold; padding:8px;">Part V: Budget</div>

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00