

Volusia County Schools

Tomoka Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Tomoka Elementary School

100 OSCEOLA AVE, Ormond Beach, FL 32176

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Roseboom

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (61%) 2014-15: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Tomoka Elementary School

100 OSCEOLA AVE, Ormond Beach, FL 32176

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	55%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Tomoka Elementary is dedicated to the success of each student by providing a caring, safe environment and rigorous learning opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Tomoka: Encourage. Empower. Engage.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roseboom, Julie	Principal	As the school's primary instructional leader, the principal communicates a vision for student achievement and guides the team's work. The principal works closely with the school's leadership team to determine the needs of Tomoka Elementary. The school-based leadership team identifies school-based needs and resources (materials and personnel) to determine how to best support students and teachers. Team members represent a leader from each grade level and department, with expertise in the areas of ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies; primary and intermediate grades; and gifted and exceptional students. Each member of the instructional leadership team serves as the liaison between leadership and their grade level team. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of problem solving teams and professional learning communities. Teacher feedback, classroom observations and student performance data are also considered.
Chehaitli, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	
Compton, Brenda	Teacher, ESE	
Coschignano, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Fox, Sue	Teacher, K-12	
Hall, Michelle	Instructional Media	
Hartman, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	
Jones, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Martino, Brenda	Administrative Support	
Shirah, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Stephenson, Lynne	Instructional Coach	
Smith, Lucille	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Melani	Assistant Principal	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	8	5	10	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	2	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	5	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

47

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/24/2019

Prior Year - As Reported
The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	6	10	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	2	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	69%	56%	57%	69%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	62%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	53%	45%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	59%	63%	78%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	56%	62%	73%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	43%	51%	78%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	57%	53%	78%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	14 ()	8 ()	5 ()	10 ()	11 ()	6 ()	54 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	19 (0)	26 (0)	51 (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.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	54%	18%	58%	14%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%
	2018	74%	58%	16%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	59%	19%	64%	14%
	2018	71%	60%	11%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	76%	54%	22%	60%	16%
	2018	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	27	33	20	35	40	30	14				

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
ELL	92	70		100	100						
ASN	94	69		94	100						
BLK	36	43	20	51	65	54	48				
HSP	69			62							
MUL	64			57							
WHT	75	70	47	81	71	59	73				
FRL	62	59	33	68	69	56	63				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	32	46	41	42	33	35	38				
ELL	64			91							
ASN	95	82		90	71						
BLK	37	46	35	45	50	50	61				
HSP	20			80							
MUL	61	54		67	62						
WHT	77	59	37	82	66	61	77				
FRL	59	58	41	66	61	57	68				
2017 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	33	44	29	39	56	45	60				
ELL	60			60							
ASN	88			94							
BLK	35	34	29	46	69	68	36				
HSP	45			73							
MUL	53	30		65	60						
WHT	77	70	56	85	74	83	86				
FRL	59	53	43	71	69	77	68				

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	65
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	86
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

ELA learning Gains in Lowest Quartile @ 40%

- Tier 1 instructional challenges
- PST process/progress monitoring
- Small group inconsistencies / non-occurrence

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

Science Achievement: -5% change

- Limited hands on and exploratory science learning activities
- Lower performing groups of grade levels arriving
- Curriculum materials (teacher dissatisfaction)
- Knowledge that science is a K-5 learning experience

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.

The greatest gap between Tomoka Elementary and the state, appeared when analyzing third grade high performing students earning a level 3 or higher. We dropped 9 points (62%) in that category while the state gained 1 point (58%), of third grade students passing ELA with level 3 or higher.

- This group of third graders historically struggled academically with K - 3 ELA content.
- Our new assessment tool for ELA differed from the previous tool, and faculty no longer had access to standards-based progress monitoring. Additionally, the new tool did not correlate with FSA (81% of 3rd graders scored on grade level on the new tool; as compared to 62% scoring level 3 or higher on FCAT ELA)

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

Math learning Gains: +9% increase

- Tutoring of our lowest quartile students
- iReady as a tool for grouping and reteaching (not by standard)
- Lesson study and Collaborative group mathematics teachers (CGI)

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

1. Attendance (54 students: 27 primary and 27 intermediate) listed with attendance below 90%
2. Large number of students scoring level 1 on Statewide Assessments (51 students)

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

1. Students with Learning Disabilities (SWD) subgroup
2. ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile
3. Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and analysis it revealed that our SWD subgroup's ELA Proficiency was at 27%, their ELA Learning Gains was 33%, and their ELA Lowest Quartile performed at 20%. These scores are well below the 41% target in one or more areas of the school report card. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Instruction in order to improve learning gains and overall proficiency for our SWD subgroup. Further analysis revealed that many of the students in our SWD subgroup were also in our two targeted ESSA subgroups: Lowest Quartile (40%) and Black/African Americans (45%) that performed near or below 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase our ESSA SWD Subgroup to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Work collaboratively with our IEP Team
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to meta-analysis, (Teacher collaboration and achievement of students with disabilities: A review of the research" - by Chris Mattatal and Keith Power), research supports collaboration between general and special education teachers as a means to improve teachers' instructional practice and to improve student outcomes.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review ESSA subgroup data and rationale for working collaboratively with IEP team to improve teaches instructional practice and student outcomes. (Principal Roseboom) 2. Facilitate professional learning on IEP/504 Accommodations and interventions on PDD. (ESE Support Teachers) 3. Monitor implementation of accommodations and interventions (e.g. via checklists, notes in gradebook, and/or notes in plan book). (Principal Roseboom) 4. Monitor documentation of collaboration between general and special education teachers via consultation log, support facilitation log, and/or emails. (Principal Intern Johnson) 5. Administer district assessments (e.g. iReady, mid-year ELA, End of year ELA, VMTs, VSTs); following district testing calendar. (Principal Intern Johnson) 6. Conduct PLCs monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions. (Instructional Coach Lynne Stephenson) 7. Highlight and share UDL strategies during PLCs and faculty meetings. (SLT Members) 8. Facilitate and support professional learning of ELA and Math curriculum. (Principal Roseboom)
Person Responsible	Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	ELA Lowest Quartile
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 69%, ELA Learning Gains was 66%, but our ELA Lowest Quartile performed at 40%, which was below the district and state average. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that many of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our two targeted ESSA subgroups: SWD (28%) and Black/African Americans (45%) that performed near or below 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 40% to 42% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-Led Small Group Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL. Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, and support for SWD. (Principal Roseboom) 2. Facilitate professional learning on ELA Wonders taught with fidelity, including small group instruction. (Instructional Coach Lynne Stephenson) 3. Administer i-Ready diagnostic to establish baseline data. (Principal Intern Johnson) 4. Conduct monthly PLCs for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions. (Instructional Coach Lynne Stephenson) 5. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE and gen. ed. teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction. (Principal Roseboom) 6. Conduct "Team Time" sessions monthly focused on developing teacher's knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction; including following ELA weekly planners. (Instructional Coach Lynne Stephenson) 7. Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction (ELA Wonders). (Instructional Coach Lynne Stephenson) 8. Conduct 2 Learning Walks with instructional coach and selected teachers during ELA Wonders small group instruction. (Principal Roseboom and Instructional Coach Stephenson) 9. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walk throughs, Observations, & Feedback. (Principal Roseboom and Principal Intern Johnson) 10. Planning and implementation of tutoring groups during after school hours; to increase ELA small group instructional time for our Lowest Quartile students; including our SWD,

and African American subgroups. (Principal Roseboom and Instructional Coach Stephenson)

Person Responsible Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3

Title Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

Rationale According to our SIP Student Survey, 25% of Tomoka students expressed feeling angry, afraid, or lonely at school.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

On the 2020 Advanced Ed. Student survey, less than 15% of Tomoka students will express feeling angry, afraid, or alone in school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Implementation of PBIS and Sanford Harmony

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

According to CASEL (2019), research demonstrates that SEL correlates with positive academic outcomes. Sanford Harmony indicates SEL skills can be effectively taught will have a direct impact on improving school-related outcomes. According to U.S. National Library of Medicine, the combination of PBIS and SEL produced significantly greater improvements in overall health and reductions in externalizing behaviors.

Action Step

Description

1. Introduce and review school-wide PBIS strategies and behavioral expectations along with discipline and student survey data. (Principal Roseboom and Principal Intern Johnson)
2. Implement school-wide PBIS common language and procedures within each classroom. (Classroom Teachers)
3. Implement professional learning on Sanford Harmony and effective SEL strategies for use within the classroom setting. (School Counselor Railsback and Instructional Coach Stephenson)
4. Conduct monthly PBIS committee meetings to review discipline data and school-wide strategies. (Principal Intern Johnson)
5. Share quarterly discipline and attendance data at faculty meetings. (Principal Roseboom)
6. Conduct one to two student voice surveys to monitor feelings of anger, fear, and loneliness. (Instructional Coach Stephenson)
7. Review PBIS, SEL, and student-generated topics on school news program quarterly. (Principal Intern Johnson)
8. Review student survey results at faculty meetings. (Instructional Coach Stephenson)
9. Implement professional learning on working with students with Behavioral Improvement Plans and related strategies. (ESE Support Teachers and PST Chair Knorr)

Person Responsible Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest Quartile	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Emotional Learning (SEL)	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00