Port Orange Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE, Port Orange, FL 32127

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Dyer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	N/A
* 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

Port Orange Elementary School

402 DUNLAWTON AVE, Port Orange, FL 32127

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/portorange/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	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

School Grades History

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

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

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
Polite, Angela	Principal	To implement and model the Florida Principal Leadership Standards at Port Orange Elementary.
Alfonso, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Alfonso serves as the kidergarten team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Alfonso represents the kindergarten instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Rossi, Charlene	Teacher, ESE	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, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Fagerstrom, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Fagerstrom serves as the 5th grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Fagerstrom represents the 5th grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Powell, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Daffin serves as the 1st grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Daffin represents the 1st grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Sparks, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Sparks serves as the 2nd grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Sparks represents the 2nd grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Woodard, Reva	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Woodard serves as the 3rd grade team leader and school based liason for team decision making. Mrs. Woodard represents the 3rd grade instructional team for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.
Duguay, Michele	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Duguay serves as the Assistant Principal and school based liason for instructional and daily campus operations. Mrs. Duguay is an administrative representative for the POE leadership team in planning, implementation, assesment and response for instructional learning tasks and initiatives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Kathryn Dyer

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.*

2

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	N/A

* 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	34	45	52	39	42	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277
Attendance below 90 percent	17	4	4	1	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 8/12/2020

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	65	59	55	60	86	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	11	5	7	11	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	7	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	65	59	55	60	86	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	398
Attendance below 90 percent	11	5	7	11	19	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	3	7	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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	70%	56%	57%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	53%	44%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	59%	63%	66%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	56%	62%	50%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	43%	51%	41%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	57%	53%	67%	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	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	54%	5%	58%	1%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	66%	54%	12%	56%	10%
	2018	66%	51%	15%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	41%	58%	-17%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	59%	-2%	64%	-7%
	2018	55%	60%	-5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	64%	54%	10%	60%	4%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	55%	9%
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	40	58	60	21	55						
HSP	62	56		55	63						
MUL	74	82		58	45						
WHT	71	65	60	65	66	45	58				
FRL	64	59	50	54	55	33	55				
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	15	54	55	25	38						
HSP	56			33							
MUL	54			31							
WHT	62	57	44	57	59	42	67				
FRL	54	53	48	46	53	37	55				
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	15			15							

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
MUL	64			73							
WHT	61	52	46	64	47	41	66				
FRL	50	47	44	56	43	40	60				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	65
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	61
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	53
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.

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains. The percentage of students in the lower quartile demonstrating a learning gain in math falls within the "D" school grade range. Interventions were not appropriately aligned to meet the needs of the students in the lowest quartile.
ESE students
Interventions

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

Science
Factors: Inconsistent instruction K-5/Lacking foundation skills/standard aligned instruction

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.

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains

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

Math Achievement

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

Attendance and percentage of students with level 1

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

1. Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains/Proficiency
2. Science Achievement
3. Culture and Environment- Social Emotional Learning
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students in the lower quartile demonstrating a learning gain is 35% Subgroup performance data specific to math lower the quartile evidences learning gains ranging from 33% to 45%
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the number of math standards mastered by students in the lower quartile (average assessment score). To increase the percentage of students in the lower quartile demonstrating a math learning gain (learning gain).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Port Orange Elementary will implement ongoing PLC cycles to plan, teach, assess and respond to student learning data across subject areas and grade levels. Classroom non-evaluative walk-through data will be used to provide differentiated instructional delivery support through best practice coaching cycles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in the lower quartile are under performing in math as evidenced by formative and summative respective to their like peers per percentile ranking data. Faculty feedback reveals a need for ongoing professional learning in the area of math instructional practice and knowledge of standards. There is a need for all stakeholders to be engaged in and contribute to the collaborative learning and planning process.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Implement a collaborative learning/planning structures
Training of Targeted PLC topics and focus based on current student performance data and classroom instruction observations.
Targeted professional learning differentiated based on need.

Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Pace and plan weekly instruction in team planning session
Pacing and planning of instruction in grade level teams.
Bi-weekly math instructional in block classroom walk-throughs for evidence collection of the on stage elements of the instructional cycle.

Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement was identified as an area of focus based on multiple years of data evidencing a downward trend in proficiency. The percentage of students in grade 5 demonstrating proficiency has decreased 19% over the last 5 years. The percentage of students scoring level 1 has increased 10% over the past 5 years.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the number of 5th grade science standards mastered (average assessment score). To increase the percentage of all students demonstrating science proficiency (percent proficient). 80% of students will demonstrate mastery on the state standardized science summative assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Daily science instruction focused on standards with a clear alignment between learning targets and learning tasks in grades K-5. Common formative assessments in grades 3-5. Administration of district assessments in grades 3-5. Timely analysis of 3rd-5th grade assessments to determine next steps for instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Aligned Science Instruction to include best practice instructional delivery models.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly pacing and planning of science instruction
Students are assessed annually in grade 5 for standards taught in grades 3-5. After careful analysis of summative data points to include historical data trends and percentile ranking comparisons, the aforementioned strategies were identified.
Data Sources:
VST data
FSA data
K-12 Lift Percentile Ranking Data
Classroom Observational Evidence (non-evaluative)
PLC Agenda and Minutes
2.Review vertical alignments of science standards across all grade levels

Person Responsible	Reva Woodard (rlwoodar@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Dedicated school wide science days for the exploration of specific science standards to include instruction, formative assessments and hands on lab experiences.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

3. Bi-weekly non-evaluative classroom walk-throughs during the science instructional block for grade 5 with specific look-for's. school-wide science days

Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the negative impact of the pandemic, stakeholders have experienced increased stress and trauma. We will focus on all aspects of student learning to include individual SEL needs.
Measurable Outcome:	Decreased stress levels of faculty, students and staff, with the development of skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, establish and maintain positive relationships. To create a collaborative learning environment To foster a culture of belonging and inclusion supported by collective efficacy and accountability To sustain a climate and culture of rigorous teaching and learning To develop respectful well rounded student scholars with the skills and confidence needed to engage peers and adults through authentic experiences and exposures A baseline stakeholder survey will be created and distributed to establish a point of comparison and measure outcomes. Stakeholders surveys will be used to measure specific outcomes. Additional EWS data points will be used to chart impact.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School-wide SEL support program (Sanford Harmony, Second Step). Ongoing review of historical absentee data, discipline and school counseling referrals, stakeholder surveys, and threat assessments. Ongoing review of historical absentee data, discipline and school counseling referrals, stakeholders surveys and threat assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to COVID slide and the effects it has had on all stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

Stakeholder Surveys

Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School-wide SEL support program (Sanford Harmony/Second Step)

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

The Port Orange Elementary House System will serve as the foundation of our school to include school-wide expectations-The House Commons, activities and experiences. House members to include students and staff will establish house traditions, collaborate for house initiatives and form strong bonds to support our school's academic, social and community goals.

Person Responsible	Angela Polite (adpolite@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.

The goal of the POE School Leadership Team is to implement the following strategies to support our three school-wide areas of focus:
To create a collaborative learning environment
To foster a culture of belonging and inclusion supported by collective efficacy and accountability
To sustain a climate and culture of rigorous teaching and learning
To develop respectful well rounded student scholars with the skills and confidence needed to engage peers and adults through authentic experiences and exposures

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.

The Port Orange Elementary will implement a school-wide House System. The POE House System will serve as the foundation of our school to include school-wide expectations-The House Commons, activities and experiences. House members to include students and staff will establish house traditions, collaborate for house initiatives and form strong bonds to support our school's academic, social and community goals.

POE House System Mission:
We hold ourselves accountable for nurturing each student to his or her potential. To teach and model responsibility and self empowerment. We are committed to the continual improvement of our professional knowledge, practice, and systems, while being responsive and predictive of the needs of our school community. Our individual contributions to our collective mission is the
Port Orange Elementary House System.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00