

Volusia County Schools

# Port Orange Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

**Table of Contents**

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Volusia County School Board on 10/31/2023.

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **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 Department 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.

## 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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

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.
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-Myrtill, 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.
Thomas, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Sac Co-Chair
Cassel, Vanessa	Teacher, K-12	Sac Co-Chair
Clowers, Abigail	Teacher, K-12	PTA Representative
Turner, Jamie	Teacher, ESE	ESE Representative
Williams, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	School Leadership Team member overseeing issues pertaining to Special Area teachers.
Tyner, Feryl	Teacher, K-12	4-5th grade Representative

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The student leadership team prioritized and discussed data during the summer school leadership meeting. Currently our subgroups are performing at 55% and above in Ela and 66% above in math. Currently the areas performing under a 61% are 5th grade ELA, 5th grade math, 5th grade science and SWD in all subject areas. During pre-planning, teachers and staff analyzed school data, learned goal areas and contributed ideas for action steps under each goal area. During the August and September SAC meetings, SAC members (including students, families, business partner, and community member) reviewed the SIP and contributed ideas for action steps.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The student leadership team meets monthly to discuss student progress monitoring. During these meetings the information shared is data from classroom walkthroughs, staff feedbacks, parental/ and community input. During monthly School Leadership Team meetings, SIP progress is reviewed and any needed changes to action steps made. This year, we will engage more formally in the Stocktake process during October and January to review adjust plans as needed. In addition, SIP goal progress is shared with SAC members monthly and any ideas for change are gathered.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 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>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	30%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B



*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	4	14	15	6	7	16	0	0	0	62	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	0	2	2	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	14	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

### Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	11	11	5	19	10	15	0	0	0	71	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	9	9	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	11	15	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	19	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	0	15	7	11	0	0	0	36

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	11	11	5	19	10	15	0	0	0	71	
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	5	7	8	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	9	9	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	16	11	15	0	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	3	4	5	0	0	0	19	

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	0	15	7	11	0	0	0	36

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review****ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	63	52	53	58	53	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				61			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				68			40		
Math Achievement*	69	55	59	63	42	50	71		
Math Learning Gains				56			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			50		
Science Achievement*	60	62	54	62	55	59	77		
Social Studies Achievement*					59	64			
Middle School Acceleration					45	52			
Graduation Rate					58	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		60	59						

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	262
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

**2021-22 ESSA Federal Index**

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)****2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	19	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	52			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	65			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	56			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	63			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	55			

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

**2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	63			69			60					
SWD	14			24							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55			64							2	
HSP	52			52							2	
MUL	87			87							2	

## 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	62			69			58				4	
FRL	53			62			48				4	

## 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	58	61	68	63	56	57	62					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	67			59								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	59	60	72	62	54	59	64					
FRL	47	58	67	54	53	56	52					

## 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	68	54	40	71	68	50	77					
SWD	18			9								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	82			82								
MUL	67			75								
PAC												
WHT	67	53	38	69	70	57	73					
FRL	60	50	46	65	62	50	73					

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	57%	7%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	53%	14%	50%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	57%	24%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	55%	5%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	51%	6%

### III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The component with the lowest performance is SWD, given that 10% of SWD were proficient on ELA PM3 and 20% of SWD were proficient on Math PM3. Contributing factors include depth of math knowledge, scheduling, and the need for more coordination between the ESE and Classroom teachers. In addition, it is a possibility that all staff could benefit from improving the overall mindset toward SWD and the importance of providing additional rigor.

5th grade science was also a lower performing area, with a 57% on the FSSA assessment.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

No area showed a decline from the prior year, but the lowest component was 5th grade ELA with no change. Our ELA assessment percentage was 56% proficient. Contributing factors could include that ELA small groups may not have been intentional enough, with standards driving all small group time. Some 5th grade students struggled to work independently and need to be taught scaffolding skills with more standards-focused questions.

Though not the lowest component, 5th grade science is a concern, with 57% proficient. Factors contributing to this data were lack of time to plan collaboratively (due to balancing demands of ELA, Math, and Science) and the need to more effectively utilize Penda and other remediation materials.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

All data components are above the state average--anywhere from 2 to 22 points above. The component that is the closest to the state average is 5th grade ELA. Contributing factors include the general difficulty of making quick progress with ELA. Increasing daily intentionality with small group planning to increase standard based focus will help to move this component. In 5th grade ELA, students were not always independently engaged in focused questioning--relying too frequently on teacher assistance.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The data component that showed the most improvement was 3rd grade Math. Third grade increased by 19%, while 4th and 5th Grade also increased by 10%. The school had explicit PD focusing on the benchmarks. Teachers were able to collaborate, and the benchmark-focused planning drove instruction.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

The two areas of concern from the EWS Part 1 are attendance and reading deficiencies. Attendance data shows that 62 of our students were present 90% or fewer days. In the area of reading deficiencies, 19 of our students show a reading deficiency.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.**

For the upcoming year, our school will focus on two key priorities for our improvement plan. First, we would like to focus on benchmark-aligned instruction (with an eye toward maintaining momentum in math, improving the performance of SWD and LQ, and also increasing the culture of planning in our school). Second, we would like to focus on our Early Warning System (targeting our second year of implementing PBIS and decreasing chronic absenteeism).

### **Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal: "All students will engage in high levels of learning every day." Assessment and walkthrough data from Port Orange Elementary indicate a need for increased alignment to the benchmarks, as well as for increased focus on the learning gains of SWD. Continuing to support teachers to deepen their understanding of the benchmarks and provide structures for planning, along with supportive coaching, will help to increase proficiencies.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

**Student Practice:**

-After administration of PM1 and PM2, our students will be in the top 10 of VCS elementary schools with respect to proficiency and growth. One hundred percent of students will show growth from PM1 to PM2 and from PM1 to PM3.

-Where ranked data is not available, we will strive to perform at 80% proficiency and higher. Throughout the school year, 75% of our LQ and SWD will perform at or above the district average on district and school assessments. By PM3, 75% of our LQ and SWD will show proficiency on state assessments.

**Teacher Practice:**

-By October 2023, instructional look-fors 1-4 will be in place in 80% of instructional settings. By January 2024, instructional look-fors 1-4 will be well implemented in 90% of instructional settings.

**Coaching Practice:**

-By February 2024, 90% of students will show growth as a result of coaching cycles for Tier 2&3 teachers.

**Monitoring:**

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

**Student Practice:**

-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.

- Student data from all district and state assessments will be disaggregated by subgroups and analyzed to determine which students are meeting proficiency.

**Teacher Practice:**

-Instructional look-fors will be monitored and analyzed through weekly walkthrough data.

-The progress of each grade level team's PLC goal will be shared and monitored by the SLT.

-Administration and coach will meet weekly to discuss progress of teachers' and PLCs' goal progress.

-Administration and coach will give feedback to teachers based on look-for progress.

**Coaching Practice:**

-District assessment and walkthrough data will be used to determine grade level PLC needs (Tier 1) and to monitor the progress of Tier 2/3 teachers participating in coaching cycles.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

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

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our strategy is to increase the enabling conditions for Collective Teacher Efficacy. 1. Increase opportunities for teacher and support collaboration, 2. Increase teachers' knowledge about one another's work, 3. Cohesive staff, 4. Continuously monitor LQ in subject (math and ELA).

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

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."

According to John Hattie, Collective Teacher Efficacy has a 1.57 effect size.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

1. We will provide professional learning related to benchmarks and curriculum materials. Professional learning will include how to enhance learning through the use of anchor charts, concrete math tools, question of the day, introducing the benchmarks, aligning student tasks, and structures for collaborative planning.

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

**By When:** According to Professional Learning Calendar

2. Walkthroughs will occur weekly, with picture walks sent to teachers to reinforce and model implementation of aligned instruction and student tasks.

**Person Responsible:** Kati Dyer (kbydyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

3. PLCs will set goals together as grade-level teams and will meet weekly. Set aside time during PLCs to include collaboration between the Gen Ed and ESE teachers to address the needs of SWD.

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

**By When:** Weekly (or as often as allowed by contract)

4. Teachers of SWD will meet every other week to monitor student progress.

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

**By When:** Every other week

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

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

**By When:** Daily

6. Based on monthly monitoring of assessment/walkthrough results, we will provide follow-up coaching and support for teacher(s) and/or teacher teams. Specific attention will be given to SWD not meeting proficiency and/or not making progress. MTSS will be implemented at the appropriate tier.

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

**By When:** Monthly

7. SLT will meet monthly to monitor SIP progress, with two formal Stocktake meetings.

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

**By When:** Monthly

8. 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:** Kati Dyer (kbyder@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Monthly

## #2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal: "All students will engage in high levels of learning every day." At Port Orange Elementary, we are working to increase the fidelity of implementation regarding our MTSS and PBIS systems to more effectively address needs with student behavior and attendance. According to the data, 22 students received two or more referrals and 62 students missed 10% or more school days in the 22-23 schools year.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

#### Student Practice:

-By October 2023, 90% of students asked will be able to explain what ROAR stands for and what those expectations look like in various parts of the campus.

-We will see a decrease in the number of students receiving 2 or more referrals, along with a 30% decrease in the number of students who are chronically absent.

#### Staff Practice:

-By October 2023, 100% of staff will be able to explain what ROAR stands for and what those expectations look like in various parts of the campus.

-All Tier 2 and 3 students (Reading), as well as students with 2 or more referrals or those missing 10% or more days, will be either making progress or will be supported through MTSS.

-By December 2023, teachers of students with 2 or more referrals will have used the Classroom Assessment Tool to determine any adjustments needed.

#### Coaching Practice:

-By February 2024, 90% of students will show growth as a result of coaching cycles for Tier 2&3 teachers.

### Monitoring:

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

#### Student Practice:

-Student progress will be monitored for students with 5% or more days of absences

-Students with two or more referrals will be monitored.

-Students on our watch list or on EWS will be monitored as well.

#### Teacher Practice:

-PBIS implementation will be monitored through walkthrough and referral data, which will include a question about the PBIS ROARs.

#### MTSS Team Practice:

-MTSS Team will meet every other week to monitor student RTI and the need for supports. Coaching support will be provided as needed.

#### PBIS Team Practice:

-PBIS Team will meet monthly to monitor student behavior data and areas of the campus that may need to be addressed.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The strategy being implemented is our school-based MTSS system which incorporates PBIS.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

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 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.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

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

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

**By When:** According to Professional Learning Calendar

2. Administration and Coach will conduct weekly walkthroughs and PLCs to monitor and reinforce the use of PBIS, providing support to teachers in and also clarifying information.

**Person Responsible:** Kati Dyer (kbyder@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Weekly

3. The MTSS Team will meet every other week to analyze data and determine the need for support. Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports will be adjusted depending on data from progress monitoring.

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

**By When:** Every other week

4. Academic Coach and/or MTSS Team Member will provide monitoring support to teachers and/or staff based on monitoring results.

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

**By When:** Daily

5. We will send home "ROARs in the Home" activity pages for parents and students to complete together.

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

**By When:** August

6. We will implement activities designed to increase the knowledge of non-instructional staff about our PBIS system. Activities will include Rolls and ROARs, Area Posters, Pop Quiz, etc.

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

**By When:** End of first quarter

7. Community Resource Fair during Red RibbonWeek with the theme of "Be Kind to Your Mind." The aim of the event is to increase family engagement and enhance school climate.

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

**By When:** Third Quarter

8. The PBIS team will monitor progress toward this goal and share with the SLT and staff

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

**By When:** Monthly

9. SLT will meet monthly to monitor SIP progress, with two formal Stocktake meetings.

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

**By When:** Monthly