

Volusia County Schools

# Orange City Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: D (38%) 2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (45%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">42%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	D	D	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

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
Bynum, Charles	Principal	Lead the school in order to create a learning environment where all students can learn and thrive.
Cinkosky, Chelsea	Assistant Principal	Support the vision of the school in order to create a learning environment where all students can learn and thrive.
Morrison, Theresa	Reading Coach	Support of teachers and students in order to achieve academic success.
Rupp, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	Provide instructional excellence to support student success.
Mack, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Provide instructional excellence to support student success.
Akins, Tonya	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Intervention
Barsanti-Ventura, Anna	Math Coach	Support of teachers and students in order to achieve academic success.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, V IR Ginia Freeman A

**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.*

0

**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.*

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

604

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

10

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

12

**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	86	97	98	93	82	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	557
Attendance below 90 percent	29	27	29	24	18	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	3	6	8	5	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	33	26	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	35	32	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	11	18	12	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

**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	5	5	10	18	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

**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	1	1	0	1	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 8/4/2022

**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	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	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	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	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	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	3	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**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	41%	53%	56%				45%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	44%						40%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						39%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	34%	42%	50%				43%	59%	63%
Math Learning Gains	38%						43%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						42%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	55%	59%				52%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

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	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	59%	-20%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
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
SWD	17	23	23	15	26	19	5				
ELL	29	48	30	16	24		14				
BLK	32	25		24	31		50				
HSP	45	57	44	36	39	23	36				
WHT	41	39	43	34	39	37	35				
FRL	37	41	35	33	35	28	35				
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				
WHT	48	38	33	43	43	36	54				
FRL	41	44	39	42	42	36	51				

**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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	308
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

**Subgroup Data**

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Math proficiency has declined yearly since 2018 in grades 3-5. Our ESSA subgroups of SWD and ELL are below the federal index. The trend is that math proficiency is low (34%). Science achievement has decreased from 40% to 37% from 2021 to 2022. ELA has trended higher than math during the last 2 testing cycles. Lowest Quartile learning gains dipped below 40% (38%) during the 21-22 school year, due to the lack of growth of the SWD ESSA subgroup.

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

Math lowest quartile (31%), Math proficiency (34%), Science proficiency (37%)

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

Contributing factors; Attendance, delivery of instruction (tier 1), intermediate teacher turnover, new ELA curriculum, intervention teacher did not begin until 2nd semester; new ELA standards, walkthrough trends indicated a lack of benchmark aligned tasks being provided to students.

New actions: close monitoring of collaborative planning with systems and structures in place to improve outcomes, walkthroughs with agreed upon look-fors, and consistent intervention.

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

Math learning gains increased from 25% in 2020 to 38% in 2022 and math lowest quartile increased from 21% in 2020 to 31% in 2022.

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

Utilized the math coach and math district resource teacher to provide tier 2 and tier 3 standards aligned, math instruction. This occurred through consistent, weekly small group instruction.

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

To accelerate learning we will utilize our math intervention teacher, math intervention will be consistently built into math block to target math deficiencies and help close the gap.

**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.**

Professional learning opportunities for the 22-23 school year will include: MTSS training, collaborative planning, BEST math curriculum trainings, Data Analysis with REA department

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

Additional services will include: Reading and math intervention teachers, before school reading club, tutoring (after school), use of computer-based academics in science w/PENDA and math with Reflex for students participating in the after school program. 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students will participate in a math, reading and science "boot camp" on Saturday before the final PM assessment.

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

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that only 41% of our students in ELA and 34% of our students in math were proficient. This was well below the district and state average. This data indicates a need for explicit and intentional benchmark aligned instruction. Additionally, we will be monitoring science as our proficiency scores decreased by 3% (37%). Our goal will be to achieve 42% proficiency in science.

**Measurable****Outcome:**

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

By January of 2023, our learner goals will be to increase the percentage of our overall proficiency from 41% to 48% in ELA and 34% to 41% in math and 37% to 42% in science, including our ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, and AA. We will utilize district Unit Assessments in ELA, Chapter Assessments in Math , and SMTs and VSTs in Science to monitor progress.

By May 2023, 90% of classroom teachers will demonstrate evidence of 4/5 of the Instructional Look-Fors related to standards aligned instruction and student tasks. By May 2023, the number of teachers receiving tier 3 support will decrease by 75%.

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

We will monitor implementation through; lesson plan checks that are benchmark aligned and provide aligned student tasks, weekly (lesson plans displayed on teacher desk or in hand) and turned in quarterly. Feedback will be provided by the leadership team. Coaches will take notes during facilitated planning to ensure the instruction is agreed upon and aligned. Walk through data will be analyzed and shared with grade level teams and/or teachers. Admin/Coaches Meeting Agenda with clear weekly goals for monitoring planning and instruction will be utilized to calibrate the team for look fors within ELA, Math and Science lessons.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based**

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

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:** Explain the

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.



**rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**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.

Establish look fors of benchmark aligned instruction and student tasks, with team leaders. Use the collaborative planning protocol to make sure our time is spent efficiently and on the benchmarks.

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

Coaches will facilitate planning to ensure plans are aligned to benchmarks/standards and incorporate higher level questioning and benchmark aligned student tasks.

**Person Responsible** Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Create, calibrate, and utilize instructional walk through tool based on look-fors.

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

Tier teachers based on instructional walk through and assessment data, using the Skill/Will Matrix, to determine level of coaching support. Create coaching schedule indicating focus, frequency and level of support.

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

Science collaborative planning will take place with support from district science resource teacher. Data review of the SMT to determine what student's know will be analyzed during PLC and action steps will be created to close the gap in science understanding and achievement.

**Person Responsible** Laura Konters (lnkonter@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis, it revealed that only 38% in ELA and 31% in math of our lowest quartile reached proficiency well below the district and state average. Further analysis showed that most of the students in our lowest quartile are also in one or more of our 3 targeted ESSA subgroups, SWD, ELL, AA.

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

By February of 2023, 75% of our students within our targeted ESSA subgroups (SWD, ELL, and AA) will show proficiency on benchmark-aligned district assessments). Our goal will be to increase the percentage of our lowest quartile reaching proficiency from 38% to 45% in ELA and 31% to 41% in math.  
 By May of 2023, 90% of teachers will provide appropriate interventions to students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 support, with integrity and fidelity.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through fidelity checks (walkthroughs and frequent checks of PM) of the interventions that were selected to ensure the fidelity and integrity of implementation (What percentage of our students are increasing?). One time per month PLC will engage in data analysis of LQ and ESSA subgroup students to determine the effect of the intervention. Instruction, curriculum and environment will all be assessed (ICEL) during each PLC.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

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

The evidence-based strategy being implemented is a robust, district-wide Multi-tiered System of Supports.  
 K-2 will implement SIPPS which is a systematic foundational skills program. It will be monitored through fidelity checks during intervention time and through monitoring of Mastery test data.  
 3-5 will implement reading comprehension intervention using Benchmark Intervention materials.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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 based on prevention. MTSS is not a “wait to fail” model for students who are in need of additional supports. The potential benefits of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports 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; Dexter, Hughes, & Farmer, 2008; Simmons, Coyne, Kwok, McDonagh, Harn, & Kame’enui, 2008; Hattie, 2015.

**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**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.

PLC – review students in intervention from the previous year and set up intervention groups based on those students. Plan for movement of students either in or out of those intervention groups. Determine how to meet the needs of these students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions based on the Decision Rules and ICEL (Instruction, Curriculum, Environment, Learner) strategy.

**Person Responsible** Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS systems and structures.

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

Monthly PLC to determine progress of lowest quartile, including ESSA subgroups, making progress towards 70% proficiency on Unit/Chapter Assessments in ELA and Math.

Bi-weekly checkpoints of targeted students - make adjustments to the intervention, as needed, through data analysis, while considering ICEL.

Monitoring fidelity of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions of LQ students through walkthroughs. Students that continue to need further supports/intervention would be identified in order to move them to Tier 3.

**Person Responsible** Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Include ESE, ESOL and Intervention teachers in PLC meetings every 3-6 weeks and Team Planning, weekly.

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

Provide coaching support based on walk through data.

**Person Responsible** Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Look at content assessment data (chapter/unit assessments), district assessments, FAST and i-Ready. Monitoring through data wall at assessment points; monitoring students at Progress Monitoring points for our proficiency goal.

**Person Responsible** Theresa Morrison (tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. 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. Discipline data showed there were 96 suspensions out of 187 events on campus. This shows a need for a positive practice approach to discipline.

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

By January of 2023, we will see a decrease in discipline referrals by 10% through the use of PBIS strategies being implemented with students.  
By May of 2023, 100% of our teachers will have participated in PBIS PLCs to discuss checklists in the fall, spring, and at the end of the year in order to monitor the implementation of PBIS strategies. The goal being to reduce the total number of suspensions by 10%, and strengthen PBIS support.  
By April of 2023, we will utilize PBIS Implementation Checklist data & Benchmarks of Quality data to progress monitor fidelity of implementation with a focus on reducing Discipline Referrals and suspensions of all student subgroups.

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

Office discipline referrals and suspensions will be monitored monthly and reported during PBIS PLCs to increase instruction in behavior for all students and intensifying monitoring of disproportionate rates of discipline utilizing Focus.  
Fidelity checklists will be monitored by the PBIS team, to be used for progress monitoring and planning towards the targeted goal.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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:  
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific**

PBIS is grounded in strategic analysis of data collected through Progress Monitoring and Data-based Decision Making Kincaid, D., Childs, K., & George, H. (2010). 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 settin goals and working together to see them through

**strategy.**

**Describe the**

**resources/**

with expected outcomes being, improved student behavior, and/or fewer office discipline referrals.

**criteria used for**

**selecting this**

**strategy.**

**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.

Professional Learning through ERPLs on MTSS/PBIS systems and structures.

**Person**

**Responsible**

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

Monthly PBIS PLCs closely follow Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS)

Year-at-a-Glance 2022-23 SY for monthly PBIS Goals and activities.

**Person**

**Responsible**

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

Continued implementation of school-wide SEL program, Sanford Harmony, daily. Positive incentives earned through Rocket buck system.

**Person**

**Responsible**

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

Monthly monitoring of student discipline & observation data

Fall- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

Spring- Complete PBIS Implementation Checklist

End-of-Year-Complete Benchmarks of Quality and Tiered Fidelity Inventory

Continue 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)

**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**

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our analysis of our district's data dashboard, we noticed that our ELA Unit assessment proficiency, based on our core instruction, varied from 44% proficient to 66% proficient. In second grade student proficiency in core common assessments ranged from 23% to 60%. i-Ready data also indicated that there is a need for more intensive foundational skills instruction in K-2. Students were provided with SIPPS and monitored through the Mastery tests. Additionally, data from our school-level walkthroughs indicate a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to grade-level foundational skills. 40 of our K-2 students have been identified as having a substantial reading deficiency.

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

The Area of Focus aligns to the District Strategic Plan Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our overall ELA Proficiency was 41% and our overall LQ was at 38%. Based on 2021-2022 ELA district assessment data for students currently in 3rd grade 45%, 4th grade 60% and 5th grade 67% of students are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Additionally, walkthrough data indicates a need for explicit and intentional instruction aligned to the intended learning of the benchmark. 43 of our 3-5 grade students have been identified as having a substantial reading deficiency.

**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)**



Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment data. Decrease the number of students listed as having a substantial reading deficiency based on our EWS data.

By January, 70% of students will show proficiency on diagnostic assessments, benchmark aligned unit assessments and FAST PM assessments.

By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.

By May, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Increase the percentage of students in each grade level that are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment according to district ELA assessment data. Decrease the number of students listed as having a substantial reading deficiency based on our EWS data.

By January, 70% of students will show proficiency on benchmark aligned unit assessments.

By May, 90% of classroom teachers will provide students benchmark-aligned tasks as evidenced by walkthroughs.

By May, the number of teachers receiving Tier 2 and 3 coaching support will decrease by 75%.

### **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.

We will monitor our area of focus through completed planning protocols, data analysis at PLCs, and walkthrough data and feedback for continued growth.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Morrison, Theresa, tjmorri1@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?

Evidence-based practices/programs being implemented are ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum aligned to the BEST Standards, SIPPS in K-3 to address foundational skills, daily small group differentiated instruction utilizing ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum to also include the intervention and enrichment toolkit. Additionally, collaborative planning with grade level teams utilizing a planning protocol and Test Item Specifications.

**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?

We will use the district approved ELA resources and curriculum for core instruction as well as interventions. These address the identified need and have a record to effectiveness for our population per the district.

**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
<p>ELA Collaborative Planning with grade level teams to include support teachers, administration, academic coach, and regional resource teachers. Academic Coach and regional resource teacher in order to ensure that instruction and students tasks are aligned to the benchmark.</p> <p>Literacy Leadership, Literacy Coaching team, including District Transformation Resource Teachers, will facilitate Professional learning on the Collaborative Planning Protocol. Formative and summative assessment data will be considered during planning.</p>	<p>Morrison, Theresa, tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Monitor ELA assessment data during weekly PLCs and Monthly School Leadership Team Meetings. Academic Coach, regional resource teacher, administration, and support staff will participate as appropriate. Additionally, a focus on Tier 2 and 3 students through progress monitoring will occur and instructional decisions made to increase student achievement.</p>	<p>Morrison, Theresa, tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>
<p>Select teachers will participate in ongoing tier 1 and tier 2 level coaching support in ELA with the academic coach. This support will include observations, feedback, modeling, lesson planning, assessment review, and as appropriate mini professional learning sessions.</p>	<p>Morrison, Theresa, tjmorri1@volusia.k12.fl.us</p>



## 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.

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. We hold an annual career day for our 4th and 5th grade students. 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 continuing the implementation of PBIS to increase positive behaviors on campus and take a positive proactive approach to discipline. Teachers and administrators serve as mentors to at risk students to add another level of support. 5th grade participated in a book study led by administration that focuses on character development. Through our AVID program, students are exposed to college and career readiness.

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

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 administration, 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. We have established a teacher leadership team that meets monthly to cultivate positive school culture.