

Volusia County Schools

Ormond Beach Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ormond Beach Elementary School

100 CORBIN AVE, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Hay

Start Date for this Principal: 5/17/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Along with the support of our families and community, Ormond Beach Elementary will ensure high levels of learning for all students in a nurturing and encouraging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement

Believing that all students in Ormond Beach Elementary School can and will learn, our mission is to provide educational programs and services of distinction, which will assure that our students attain their potential. Through the cooperative commitment of family, community and school, students will acquire knowledge, wisdom, and ethics which will enable them to be successful contributors in a democratic society.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Callahan, Sarah	Assistant Principal	Facilitate the creation of the (pre-, mid-, and end of year) SIP, provide assistance in monitoring data and plan implementation, provide input and feedback regarding action steps and the validity and reliability of such, and facilitate the mid-year reflection (including data collection). Review the SIP with the school's SAC committee and other stakeholders; provide input and feedback to the leadership team in order to make adjustments.
Neat, Jeanne	Teacher, K-12	As a grade-level leader, serve as a member of the Leadership (decision-making) team. Assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and assist with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade-level and school-wide teams. Provide input and feedback with regard to the SIP implementation and action step, as well as provide feedback on the mid-year reflection data.
Hammonds, Robbin	Teacher, K-12	As a grade-level leader, serve as a member of the Leadership (decision-making) team. Assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and assist with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade-level and school-wide teams. Provide input and feedback with regard to the SIP implementation and action step, as well as provide feedback on the mid-year reflection data.
Lohmann, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	As a grade-level leader, serve as a member of the Leadership (decision-making) team. Assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and assist with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade-level and school-wide teams. Provide input and feedback with regard to the SIP implementation and action step, as well as provide feedback on the mid-year reflection data.
Tomlinson, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	As a grade-level leader, serve as a member of the Leadership (decision-making) team. Assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and assist with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade-level and school-wide teams. Provide input and feedback with regard to the SIP implementation and action step, as well as provide feedback on the mid-year reflection data.
Every, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	As a grade-level leader, serve as a member of the Leadership (decision-making) team. Assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and assist with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade-level and school-wide teams. Provide input and feedback with regard to

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the SIP implementation and action step, as well as provide feedback on the mid-year reflection data.
Hay, Shannon	Principal	Process assessment and other data to determine SIP goals. Work with Leadership Team to determine the needs (instructional, resource, intervention, etc.) of teacher, students and staff. Identify implementation action steps and monitor implementation for effectiveness. Reflect on data and make determinations as to modifications, etc.
Reheiser, Julie	Instructional Coach	Assist in beginning and monitoring the implementation of the SIP, provide resources (material, instructional approaches), and help analyze data for instructional, intervention and other student achievement purposes. Collect data. Assist in communicating the SIP and Mid-Year review data to all stakeholders.
Bronson, Jennifer	Other	Assist with the design, implementation, and assessment of intervention strategies.
Cowin, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	As a grade-level leader, serve as a member of the Leadership (decision-making) team. Assist with the implementation of action steps within grade level, and assist with the collection, interpretation, and reflection of data with grade-level and school-wide teams. Provide input and feedback with regard to the SIP implementation and action step, as well as provide feedback on the mid-year reflection data.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 5/17/2018, Shannon Hay

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

0

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

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

17

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	32	52	45	35	42	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/17/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	58	48	52	45	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	9	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	70	58	48	52	45	61	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	9	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	68%	56%	57%	67%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	58%	63%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	46%	53%	63%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	65%	59%	63%	78%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	64%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	43%	51%	56%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	59%	57%	53%	44%	58%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	58%	21%	58%	21%
	2018	67%	56%	11%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	54%	7%	58%	3%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	60%	17%	62%	15%
	2018	78%	58%	20%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
	2018	77%	60%	17%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
	2018	73%	57%	16%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	32	33	36	26	35	33	17				
BLK	47	46		53	38						
HSP	73	70		57	55						
MUL	55			55							
WHT	71	62	52	69	51	42	68				
FRL	65	58	45	64	49	48	57				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	75	63		81	79		31				
BLK	48	56		55	35		20				
HSP	58	55		58	64						
WHT	71	65	65	84	71	62	50				
FRL	66	65	67	77	66	63	43				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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
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	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	64
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	59
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

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Our largest decline in student achievement occurred within our population of Students with Disabilities in the area of math, declining from 81% to 26% (55 pts.) overall. Learning gains in math (most specifically SWD, FRL, and African American); learning gains of the lowest 25% (most specifically SWD, FRL, and African American). Subgroups may have been effected by grouping and/or instructional approaches; contributions may also include common assessments being implemented less frequently and less impactful use of data to drive interventions and supports.

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

Our largest decline in student achievement occurred within our population of Students with Disabilities in the area of math, declining from 81% to 26% (55 pts.) overall. The factors our team believes have caused the decline include: a lack of automaticity in skill, procedures, and application of skill; struggles comprehending text to determine what the questions is asking students to solve; lack of stamina.

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

Meeting higher standards in math learning gains had the largest gap when compared with the state avgerage. The factors our team believes have caused the decline include: a lack of automaticity in skill, procedures, and application of skill; struggles comprehending text to determine what the questions is asking students to solve; lack of stamina.

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

Science by 12 pts. PD on the science standards and the progression of skill/standards from K-5; academic coaching support; more effective use of data analysis to drive instruction, interventions, and supports; science tutoring made available to students; academic/instructional coaching.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance, specifically tardiness, is an area of concern that we would like to address within our school. Though our attendance data is showing that we are slightly above the District average, we have concerns about the number of students who have absences (10-14 days = 24 students, and 15+ days= 7 students).

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA and math for Students with Disabilities.
2. Increase student achievement in ELA and math for students in the lowest quartile.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student achievement in ELA for Students With Disabilities. This area of focus was chosen because our second largest decline in student achievement occurred within our population of Students with Disabilities in the area of ELA, declining from 75% to 30% (45 pts.) overall.

Measureable Outcome: Increase achievement for our SWD from 30% to 50% in ELA standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Callahan (sacallah@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase the frequency in which data analysis is used, and use that data to plan instruction to increase instructional rigor in small group rotations and provide student-specific remediation/interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If OBE increases the frequency of data analysis gleaned from a variety of progress monitoring tools, we will increase the amount of consistent and reliable data from which we can design effective small group direct instruction and interventions/remediations to address student needs/gaps. John Hattie's Visible Learning reports an effect size of 1.29 for Response to Intervention, .77 effect size for Comprehensive Interventions for Learning Disabled Students, and 0.60 for Direct Instruction 0.60.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review ELA achievement data for our Students with Disabilities.
2. Professional Learning in Collaborative Teaching (classroom teacher/support facilitator), Universal Design for Learning, Differentiated Instruction, and Collective Efficacy
3. Classroom, intervention, and ESE teachers will use instructional programs such as iReady and common assessments to collect, analyze, and monitor individual student data. This data will be reviewed and discussed in weekly PLCs to allow for adjustments to interventions/remediations
4. Monthly SWD data reviews will be conducted by the Administrative Team; coaching cycles and changes in instructional practices will be addressed at that time
5. Coaching cycles with identified instructional staff
6. Review of IEP goals to track mastery of IEP goal achievement
7. Quarterly data chats with identified stakeholders.
8. Instructional Staff Needs Survey at the end of each semester (this will drive professional learning,
9. Identify Title resources that can be used to support learning

Person Responsible Shannon Hay (sehay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student achievement in math for Students With Disabilities. This area of focus was chosen because our largest decline in student achievement occurred within our population of Students with Disabilities in the area of math, declining from 81% to 26% (55 pts.) overall.

Measureable Outcome: Increase achievement for our SWD from 26% to 50% in math standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Callahan (sacallah@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase the frequency in which data analysis is utilized and use that data to plan instruction to increase instructional rigor in small group rotations and provide student-specific remediation/interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If OBE increases the frequency of data analysis gleaned from a variety of progress monitoring tools, we will increase the amount of consistent and reliable data from which we can design effective small group direct instruction and interventions/remediations to address student needs/gaps. John Hattie's Visible Learning reports an effect size of 1.29 for Response to Intervention, .77 effect size for Comprehensive Interventions for Learning Disabled Students, and 0.60 for Direct Instruction 0.60.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review math achievement data for our Students with Disabilities.
2. Professional Learning in Collaborative Teaching (classroom teacher/support facilitator), Universal Design for Learning, Differentiated Instruction, and Collective Efficacy
3. Classroom, intervention, and ESE teachers will use iReady, SuccessMaker/Waterford, and common assessments to collect, analyze, and monitor individual student data. This data will be reviewed and discussed in weekly PLCs to allow for adjustments to interventions/remediations
4. Monthly SWD data reviews will be conducted by the Administrative Team; coaching cycles and changes in instructional practices will be addressed at that time
5. Coaching cycles with identified instructional staff
6. Review of IEP goals to track mastery of IEP goal achievement
7. Quarterly data chats with identified stakeholders.
8. Instructional Staff Needs Survey at the end of each semester
9. Identify Title resources that can be used to support learning

Person Responsible Shannon Hay (sehay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase student achievement in ELA for students in the lowest quartile. This area of focus was chosen because student achievement within our population of students in the lowest quartile in ELA declined from 63% to 33% (30 pts.).

Measureable Outcome: Increase achievement for students in the lowest quartile from 33% to 50% in ELA learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Reheiser (jmreheis@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Direct instruction in small group rotations; implement regular, small group interventions that address individual student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: John Hattie’s Visible Learning reports an effect size of 1.29 for Response to Intervention and 0.60 for Direct Instruction 0.60.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review ELA learning gains and achievement data and identify students in the lowest quartile (LQ)
2. Professional Learning on effective direct instruction and instruction in small group
3. Collect, analyze, and monitor individual student data regularly (2-4 weeks) using multiple assessment and data collection tools.
4. Review data in weekly PLCs to allow for adjustments to interventions/remediations
4. Monthly LQ data reviews will be conducted by stakeholders (ESE, ELL, intervention teachers, Academic Coach and administrative team); coaching cycles, instructional practices, and intervention groups will be addressed at that time
5. Initiate coaching cycles with identified instructional staff
6. Student-led goal setting
7. Quarterly data chats with identified stakeholders.
8. Instructional Staff Needs Survey at the end of each semester
9. Identify Title resources that can be used to support learning

Person Responsible Shannon Hay (sehay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase student achievement in math for students in the lowest quartile. This area of focus was chosen because student achievement within our population of students in the lowest quartile in math declined from 79% to 35% (44 pts.).
Measureable Outcome:	Increase achievement for students in the lowest quartile from 35% to 50% in math learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Reheiser (jmreheis@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Direct instruction in small group rotations; implement regular, small group interventions that address individual student needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie’s Visible Learning reports an effect size of 1.29 for Response to Intervention, .77 effect size for Comprehensive Interventions for Learning Disabled Students, and 0.60 for Direct Instruction 0.60.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review math learning gains and achievement data and identify students in the lowest quartile (LQ)
2. Professional Learning on effective direct instruction and instruction in small group
3. Collect, analyze, and monitor individual student data regularly (2-4 weeks) using multiple assessment and data collection tools.
4. Review data in weekly PLCs to allow for adjustments to interventions/remediations
4. Monthly LQ data reviews will be conducted by stakeholders (ESE, ELL, intervention teachers, Academic Coach and administrative team); coaching cycles, instructional practices, and intervention groups will be addressed at that time
5. Initiate coaching cycles with identified instructional staff
6. Student-led goal setting
7. Quarterly data chats with identified stakeholders.
8. Instructional Staff Needs Survey at the end of each semester
9. Identify Title resources that can be used to support learning

Person Responsible Shannon Hay (sehay@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

--	--

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Attendance is an additional area of concern needing to be addressed at OBE. Although OBE has a higher overall Average Daily Attendance (ADA) rate than the District (95%), there are 39 students identified through EWS with attendance less than 90%. To address our students with attendance and tardiness issues, our team will: hold biweekly attendance meetings with our administrative team, school counselor, and school social worker to identify students at risk (SW will be provided meeting minutes when unable to join meetings). The school counselor and social worker will communicate expectations for attendance, student learning impact, and the importance of attending school each day. The school counselor, administrative team, and social worker will work with parents to identify possible barriers to attendance and work with families to problem solve solutions to improve attendance.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Ormond Beach Elementary School builds a positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders. Students have the opportunity every month to earn CHAMPion rewards for good behavior, in addition to individual classroom rewards. Certificates for academics, attendance, and other teacher-determined recognitions are awarded to students each quarter, with an awards ceremony for students and parents held at the end of the year. To promote unity, we invite all our stakeholders to wear their OBE shirts each Friday; we also have special t-shirt days in recognition of autism awareness, breastcancer, and bullying awareness. Our Safety Patrol works with our Kindergarten and 1st grade students to escort them to their after school locations; this aligns our younger kids with a "buddy" to ease anxieties they may have when transitioning in larger crowds. OBE holds 100th Day Celebrations, Idiom Day, and Literacy Week where all students and staff members are invited to participate collectively in a daily theme. Before kicking off Spring testing, our staff organizes a pep rally for our 3rd-5th Graders; Seabreeze HS band and dance teams come to perform, along with our staff members, for our students.

Ormond Beach Elementary School invites parents and community stakeholders to be involved in a variety of ways. The School Advisory Council, comprised of family and community members, business partners, and school staff, are responsible for reviewing and providing

input on our annual climate surveys taken by families, staff, and students. Parent Input Forms are located in the main office year-round, and we use social media (Twitter, FaceBook), as well as our website, to advertise school events, communicate important information. Teachers are asked to meet a minimum of once per semester with parents to form a relationship and to "touch base" regarding student successes and concerns, if applicable.

OBE also holds traditions for our staff. We host a Welcome Back Breakfast and Meet the Teacher Luncheon for our staff. Staff member recognitions are done at faculty meetings, the Teacher of the Year is celebrated in some way each month, and we are implementing a new recognition board where staff members can give "shout outs" to others who have helped them in some way.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00