

Volusia County Schools

Port Orange Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Dyer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that all students will reach high levels of learning through the commitment of our school community. We collaborate to implement and monitor a highly rigorous learning environment by assessing student learning and responding to meet the needs of every student.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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.
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 liaison for instructional and daily campus operations. Mrs. Duguay is an administrative representative for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assessment 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.
Philon-Myrtil, Jasmine	School Counselor	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining to Counseling.
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 teachers.
McComb, Anna	Instructional Media	School Leadership Team Member and AVID site team lead.
Clowers, Abigail	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair and SLT member.
Turner, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining relating to PTA.
Mellinger, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining to MTSS.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Kathryn Dyer

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

325

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

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	38	50	50	66	56	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	5	19	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	2	0	15	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/3/2022

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	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	

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	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	

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	58%	53%	56%				70%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						65%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						53%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	42%	50%				64%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						63%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						35%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	55%	59%				59%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	59%	-2%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	60%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
HSP	67			59							
WHT	59	60	72	62	54	59	64				
FRL	47	58	67	54	53	56	52				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We performed lower overall in proficiency scores as compared to the prior year. We are above the district and state averages in all subject areas. Overall, learning gains are higher in ELA and lower in Math. Hispanic students have a higher school grade (63%) compared to our overall school grade (61%). SWD are performing higher than the prior year (43% in 21-22 vs. 28% in 20-21).

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

When analyzing school grade data, ELA and Math proficiencies stand out as the scores with the greatest need for improvement. ELA proficiency decreased 10% from 2021 and Math decreased 8%. Math learning gains overall dropped 12%. Although science proficiency was 62%, it represents a 15% decrease from 2021. In addition, student attendance is a measure that needs improvement.

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

Walkthrough trends showed the need for greater alignment between instruction and new standards. Teachers planned for aligned instruction, but are still getting comfortable with new textbooks and new standards.

We believe that continuing to support teachers to better understand ELA and Math instructional materials and benchmarks, as well as increasing supportive coaching, will help increase proficiencies. We also see the need for a schoolwide initiative related to attendance that is also aligned with our PBIS.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to FSA school grade percentages, learning gains in the following areas saw the highest increases over prior year scores:

ELA LG increased from 54% to 61%.

ELA LG LQ increased from 40% to 68%.

Math LG LQ increased from 50% to 57%.

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

Tier 1: In PLCs, we focused on curriculum implementation, with an emphasis on effective use of small group time and best materials to use for differentiation. ERPLs focused on standards-based planning.

Tier 2: Students in greatest need of improvement were assigned to tutoring and instruction; tutoring was based on students' lowest-performing standards.

Tier 3: Most students performing below grade level, whether they were identified as being in the lowest quartile or not, received tutoring and/or intervention support.

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

Tier 1: In order to align instruction to benchmarks, teachers will use aligned curriculum for ELA (Benchmark series) and Math (Big Ideas). To support teachers to most effectively use these materials, professional learning will be offered during PLCs, ERPLs, and coaching. Picture walks showing implementation of aligned instruction and student tasks will be sent to teachers to provide feedback. Teachers will participate in learning walks.

Tier 2: We will continue data-based tutoring and intervention for students performing below grade-level proficiency.

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.

To support teachers to most effectively use curriculum materials, professional learning will be offered during PLCs, ERPLs, and coaching. Picture walks showing implementation of aligned instruction and student tasks will be sent to teachers to provide feedback. Teachers will participate in learning walks.

To improve both culture and climate, we will implement PBIS and relational strategies school-wide.

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

To ensure sustainability, we will have our SLT and PBIS Teams meet monthly to reflect on our data and monitor SIP implementation. We will be sure to include MTSS as one of the key monitoring areas of the SLT. In addition, we will conduct regular data chats with teachers. At the end of the year, we will review student data with teacher teams and create a "watch list" of students who need continued interventions at the beginning of the next schoolyear. Once state level data arrives, the SLT will reflect on the data in order to determine areas of focus for the following year's SIP.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day (1a, 1b, 1d, 1e). Walkthrough data indicates a need for greater alignment between instruction and new standards. In 2020-21 teachers planned for aligned instruction, but were still getting comfortable with new textbooks and new benchmarks in ELA. This year, teachers will have new math curriculum and benchmarks. Continuing to support teachers to better understand ELA and Math instructional materials and benchmarks, as well as increasing supportive coaching, will help increase proficiencies.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students: On district assessments, students in K-2 will perform at proficiency rates of 85% in ELA and 90% in math. Students in 3-5 will perform at proficiency rates of 70% in ELA and 80% in math on district assessments. By diagnostic 3, all students in grades 3-5 will make 100% annual typical growth and 75% of students will perform on grade level in ELA and math. In all grade levels, 75% of students will perform at the proficient level.

Teachers: By January 2023, at least 75% of teachers will participate in benchmark-aligned collaborative planning sessions. By May 2023, 100% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthrough data.

Coaching: By April 2023, the number of teachers receiving tier 2 or tier 3 coaching will decrease by 50%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students: Student progress will be monitored through assessment data (district, iReady, writing exemplars, and FAST) for all students. Additionally, data (grades, district assessments, FAST, ORF, etc.) will be monitored to determine the effectiveness of interventions for Tier 2/3, lowest quartile, and subgroup students. We will also monitor the progress of students in the gifted program who are performing below expectation (85% or higher proficiency for students receiving gifted services) on district assessments.

Teachers: Task alignment will be monitored through walkthrough data. In addition, the progress of each grade level team's PLC goal will be shared and monitored by the School Leadership Team.

Coaching: District assessment data will be used to monitor the progress of Tier 2/3 teachers participating in coaching cycles.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our strategy is to increase the enabling conditions for Collective Teacher Efficacy (1. Advanced teacher influence, 2. Goal consensus, 3. Teachers' knowledge about one another's work, 4. Cohesive staff, 5. Responsiveness of leadership, and 6. Effective systems of intervention).

We will aim to provide these conditions by providing professional learning, PLCs, collaborative planning supports, peer observations, and feedback.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. According to Jenni Donohoo in Collective Efficacy, "the theory is fostering collective teacher efficacy to realize increased student achievement, and it involves creating opportunities or meaningful collaboration, empowering teachers, establishing goals and high expectations, and helping educators interpret results and provide feedback."

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. According to John Hattie, Collective Teacher Efficacy has a 1.57 effect size.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will provide professional development related to B.E.S.T. standards and curriculum materials.

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

PLCs will set goals together as grade-level teams and will meet weekly. Teachers will participate in learning walks aligned to their PLC goals.

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

Grade-level teams will meet twice a month after school to plan collaboratively.

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

The academic coach will support new teachers, as well as teachers receiving Tier 2/3 coaching supports.

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

We will conduct regular walkthroughs of the ELA and math blocks. Picture walks showing implementation of aligned instruction and student tasks will be sent to teachers to provide feedback.

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

SLT will meet monthly to monitor SIP progress.

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

Based on monthly monitoring of results, we will provide follow-up coaching or support for teacher(s) and/or teacher teams.

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

We will adjust intervention and tutoring scheduling or materials depending upon student progress monitoring data (district, iReady, writing exemplars, and FAST). All students will be monitored, but in particular Tier 2/3, lowest quartile, D/F grades, and subgroup students. We will also monitor the progress of students in the gifted program who are performing below expectation (85% or higher proficiency) on district assessments.

Person Responsible Lisa Mellinger (lmellin@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 3: Provide a Safe, healthy, and supportive environment. Student behaviors, such as physical and verbal aggression, have increased in recent years as indicated by increases in incidents of physical aggression and increases in referrals.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students: During the 2022-2023 school year, we will see an overall decrease in referrals and suspensions of 30% from the previous year. We will also see a decrease in the percent of students who are chronically absent.

Teachers: By January 2023, 100% percent of teachers will implement the school-wide PBIS process and engage in relational capacity activities two times per week.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Students: Student progress will be monitored for students with grades of Ds or Fs, with 5% or more days of absence, with two or more referrals, or who are identified on the EWS report.

Teachers: PBIS implementation and relational capacity activities will be monitored through walkthrough data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The strategy being implemented is a multi-tiered system of supports; our school-based MTSS system incorporates PBIS and AVID.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

MTSS is grounded in careful analysis of data collected through progress monitoring and data-based decision-making. The power of a tiered system of supports rests in the fact that it is preventative. MTSS is not a "wait to fail" model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of an MTSS were outlined in John Hattie's work and can yield an effect size of 1.29 when implemented with fidelity. Source: Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The PBIS Team will participate in summer training to learn about PBIS and to build our school-wide behavior system.

Person Responsible Leslie Sparks (lasparks@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will participate in professional learning related to MTSS, PBIS and AVID.

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

The PBIS team will meet monthly to monitor progress toward this goal and share updates with SLT and staff.

Person Responsible Leslie Sparks (lasparks@volusia.k12.fl.us)

We will host grade-level student assemblies to teach expectations and reward structures for PBIS.

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

We will conduct weekly walkthroughs and PLC check-ins to monitor and reinforce use of PBIS and AVID relational capacity strategies, providing clarity and support as needed. Picture walks showing implementation of PBIS and AVID relational capacity strategies will be sent to teachers to provide feedback.

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

The PBIS committee will meet to create a calendar of quarterly staff and student reward events.

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

Based on monitoring results, we will provide follow-up coaching or support for teacher(s) and/or teacher teams.

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

We will adjust Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports depending upon student progress monitoring data (students with grades of Ds or Fs, with 5% or more days of absence, with two or more referrals, or who are identified on the EWS report).

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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dyer, Kati, kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

NA	Dyer, Kati, kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us
----	--------------------------------------

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Port Orange Elementary will build upon our existing House System to implement PBIS school-wide. House members include all students and staff who establish house traditions, collaborate for house initiatives, and form strong bonds to support our school's academic, social, and community goals.

Our school will provide regular SEL lessons for all students, and our media specialist will teach digital citizenship lessons. For tier 2 (SEL), we are intentionally selecting groups of students to participate in small group counseling sessions based on similar needs.

We will host Family Nights and parent engagement activities. Port Orange Elementary is fortunate to have partnerships with local businesses and churches, as well as a community food-pantry organization called Provision Packs.

These initiatives and partnerships work together to provide a positive school culture for all and resources for those in need.

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

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, PBIS/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 and inclusive culture and environment. Nominated students also serve as 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 also help to recognize faculty and staff for their positive contributions to the school.