Pride Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pride Elementary School

1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pride/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Eilene Ahr C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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

Pride Elementary School

1100 LEARNING LN, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pride/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	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.

At Pride we will strive to build meaningful relationships without students, parents, community, faculty, and staff in order for them to grow academically, socially, and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the individual commitment of all, our students will graduate with the knowledge, skills and values necessary to be successful contributors to our 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
Johnson, Elizabeth	Principal	Oversees the day to day operation of the school.
Madison, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Assist teachers with instructional/classroom,technology needs, and supports small group instruction.
Roberts, Melanie	Teacher, K-12	ESE Support Facilitation, DLTL
Swindle, Amber	Teacher, K-12	K-5 Intervention Teacher
Sylvester, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Assists the prinicpal with the day to day operation of the school and student discipline.
Ebert, Emma	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Teacher, Team Leader
Harvey, Timberlay	Teacher, K-12	Media Specialist, Testing Coordinator
Bell, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher, Team Leader
Lane, Susan	Teacher, K-12	K-5 Intervention Teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/28/2020, Eilene Ahr C

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
49

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	61	57	64	80	64	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	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
Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	77	88	105	99	85	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	6	7	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	17	9	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	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	77	88	105	99	85	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	6	7	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	17	9	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	0	17	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	49%	56%	57%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	63%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	46%	53%	51%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	63%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	43%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	57%	53%	42%	59%	51%

	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	51%	58%	-7%	58%	-7%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	54%	-7%	58%	-11%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%
	2018	57%	57%	0%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	56%	-12%	53%	-9%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	20	41	40	15	22	8	20				
ELL	27	33	31	41	42	17	25				
BLK	42	60		42	50		27				
HSP	43	45	37	53	47	25	37				
MUL	46			36							
WHT	58	61	54	63	49	20	61				
FRL	46	52	47	52	46	25	43				
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	13	21	19	18	26	22	15				
ELL	38	36	30	38	41						
BLK	46	44		42	25						
HSP	49	39	25	56	54	47	43				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	56	57	25	63	58	40	65				
FRL	50	46	28	54	50	36	51				

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	18	38	29	30	52	47	25				
ELL	49	63		57	74						
BLK	40	77		50	64						
HSP	57	66	47	59	68	61	34				
MUL	50			67							
WHT	57	62	56	66	58	44	50				
FRL	51	60	47	59	65	55	38				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	43
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	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
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	45
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.

The lowest performing data component is in Math and Science. The trends are our SWD and ELL populations who are consistently under performing compared to our other sub groups

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was in Math. A factor that attributed to this decline was the entire school looping with their grade level.

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 was with our SWD and ELL populations. They performed substaintially lower than our other sub groups.

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

The data component with the most improvement was our lowest quartile which showed the greatest learning gains in ELA and Math. The action that helped obtain the growth was our push in ESE small group along with program specific training for ESE teachers.

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

The number of discipline referrals that students are receiving across all grade levels.

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

1. Math
2. Science
3. ELL students
4. SWD students
5. Behavior

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our math overall proficiency was at 55% which is a decrease from 57% the previous year. Our SLT decided to focus on math standards- based instruction to improve math gains and overall proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Pride Elementary's overall achievement level will increase from 55% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a .79 effect size based on Hattie's research.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review i-Ready, FSA, math unit tests to identify students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support.
2. Facilitate PL on small group instruction
3. Facilitate PL on standards-based instruction
4. Professional development on new curriculum maps.
5. Conduct Learning Walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction
6. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data support services to plan instruction
7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction
8. State initiative with walk to intervention.
9. Intervention enrichment for students.
10. Training on Journey Through Quarter One.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 NGSS data, it revealed that our science overall proficiency was at 44% which is a decrease from 54% the previous year. Our SLT decided to focus on science standards-based instruction to improve science proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Pride Elementary's overall science achievment level will increase from 44% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a .79 effect size based on Hattie's research.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review SMT data and VST data to identify students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support.
2. Facilitate PL on small group instruction
3. Facilitate PL on standards-based instruction
4. Conduct Learning Walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction.
5. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data support services to plan instruction.
7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction
8. District Science Specialist Data Chat with Admin and Teachers

Person Responsible	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 FSA data, it revealed that our ELA overall proficiency was at 52% which is a decrease from 49% the previous year. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA standards- based instruction to improve ELA gains and overall proficiency for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Pride Elementary's overall ELA achievement level will increase from 49% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	standards-based instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This along with standards-based instruction/planning will create a solid response to intervention which has a .79 effect size based on Hattie's research.

Action Steps to Implement	

1. Review i-Ready, FSA, ELA unit tests to identify students for interventions, ESE and ESOL support.
2. Facilitate PL on small group instruction
3. Facilitate PL on standards-based instruction
4. Professional development on new curriculum maps.
5. Conduct Learning Walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction
6. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data support services to plan instruction
7. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in standards-based instruction
8. State intitiative with Walk to Intervention
9. Intervention Enrishment
10. District support for our school wide implementation of Core Connections.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Johnson (eajohns1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#4. Other specifically relating to CHAMPS Implementation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis and our 2019 EWS and ESSA, it revealed that we had 235 referrals for the 2019-2020 school year. Our SLT decided to focus on a positive behavioral intervention program to improve behavior and decrease the number of referrals.
Measurable Outcome:	Pride Elementary's overall referrals will decrease by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	EWS data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A Behavioral Intervention Program has a .62 effect size based on Hattie's research.

Action Steps to Implement

1. District support for implementing CHAMPS.
2. School wide implementation for CHAMPS procedures in common areas.
3. Create Coaching Cycles to support teacher growth in CHAMPS.
4. Conduct learning walks with coach, teacher and district staff during whole and small group instruction to support CHAMPS.
5. Conduct monthly progress meetings with ESE, ELL, and intervention teachers to review data in order to support our behavior initiatives.
6. CHAMPS Committee to create expectation videos for common areas to be shared during first week or school and monthly thereafter.

Person Responsible	Lisa Sylvester (lmsylves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

District Math and Science support, push-in model for our ELL, ESE and intervention teachers, workshops to support standards-based instruction across all subject areas and implementation of a school-wide behavior plan.

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.

Creation of a school wide PTO, planned family engagement activites based on academics, SAC, and continued out reach programs such as, guidance counselor, parent support groups and parent liason support.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.