

Volusia County Schools

# Orange City Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

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

## Demographics

**Principal: V IR Ginia Freeman A**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

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

## Orange City Elementary School

555 E UNIVERSITY AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/orangecity/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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

All students learn at Orange City School, where CPR – Cooperation, Pride, and Respect – brings us to life and helps us to do our best.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange City Elementary... where hard work opens doors to a brighter tomorrow.

### 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
Bynum, Charles	Principal	Principal
Morrison, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach
Bowen, Erin	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor
Sheehan, Phil	Teacher, K-12	Primary Teacher 1st Grade
Turner, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Primary Teacher 3rd Grade
Mack, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Intermediate 4th Grade Teacher

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, V IR Ginia Freeman A

**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

28

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	58	80	75	68	72	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	420
Attendance below 90 percent	3	11	9	15	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	0	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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**

Tuesday 7/28/2020

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	17	12	11	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

**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	1	2	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	7	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	17	12	11	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

**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	1	2	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

**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	7	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	45%	56%	57%	48%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	40%	56%	58%	44%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	46%	53%	36%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	43%	59%	63%	47%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	43%	56%	62%	43%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	43%	51%	30%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	54%	-12%	58%	-16%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	59%	-20%	64%	-25%
	2018	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	55%	-1%
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	16	37	35	9	28	32	26				
ELL	35	20		40	53						
BLK	19	29		19	21						
HSP	41	45		52	55		44				
WHT	48	38	33	43	43	36	54				
FRL	41	44	39	42	42	36	51				
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	10	29	27	18	41	33	18				
ELL	30	40	30	35	63	70					
BLK	23	23		27	15						
HSP	40	41	36	46	50	50	63				
MUL	38			38							
WHT	52	47	41	48	44	38	57				
FRL	45	44	40	46	43	31	54				
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	18	24	24	14	16	11	7				
ELL	23	22		41	33						
BLK	27	29		23	21						
HSP	44	31		39	35		36				
MUL	55			27							
WHT	50	49	38	52	46	30	48				
FRL	45	43	36	44	39	27	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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	349
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	39
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	42
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	42
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.**

ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains  
 Departmentalized half-way through the year with substitute teachers.  
 No set curriculum in ELA or Math.

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

ELA Learning Gains and Science Achievement. We have a large population( 75%) of students that are economically disadvantaged and ESE (18%) that contribute to the gaps.

**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 Achievement has a 20% gap. The inconsistency of teachers and instruction in the classroom.

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

Math lowest 25% increased from 36% to 42%. Math intervention teacher supported lowest quartile students in grades 4 and 5.

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

Two areas of concern include our student attendance lower than 90% and our students who have scored a level 1 in the of math on the FSA.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains-lowest 25%
2. ESE subgroup
3. ESOL subgroup
4. Math proficiency
5. Science Proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:****#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our African American, ESE, ESOL, Homeless, and male subgroups are below the federal index of 41%. The lowest 25% in ELA showed the greatest decline from 2018-2019.
---	---

<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	All ESSA subgroups will meet or exceed the federal index of 41%.
----------------------------	--

<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---	---

<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Differentiation embedded in instruction with the Wonders, enVision, and Core Connections
---------------------------------	--

<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Building collective efficacy and collaboration with general education teachers, administration, coaches and support teachers. District provided resources, curriculum, and assessments.
---	--

**Action Steps to Implement**

Include ESE, ESOL and Intervention teachers in weekly PLC meetings and Team Planning

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaching Cycles focused on Differentiation

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct quarterly data walks with administration, coaches, and teacher leaders.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Orange City Elementary's science scores declined 5% from 2018-2019.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Increase Science proficiency by 5% to meet or exceed the district and state average.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Standards-based instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	According to Hattie's research: Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29 and vocabulary programs have an effect size of .62.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate PL on Science Trace Mapping with K-5

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Team Planning with Subject Lead in PLC meetings

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct data walks quarterly with administration, coaches and teacher leads.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor Science instruction through ongoing administrative walk-through and feedback.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor progress using SMT/VST during PLC meetings.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	To build the capacity of the school leadership team and improving systems for teacher efficacy.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	51% of students taking the FSA will score a 3 or higher in Math and ELA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Providing timely specific feedback to instructional staff and building teacher efficacy.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	According to Hattie's research, Feedback has .70 effect size and collective teacher efficacy has an effect size of 1.57.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Create subject leads in each grade level.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly Data walks with administration, coaches and team leaders.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Quarterly meetings with School Leadership Team.

**Person Responsible** Charles Bynum (cdbynum@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.

**Orange City Elementary will focus on decreasing the number of discipline referrals and out of school suspensions by using a discipline flow chart.**

## 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.

Orange City Elementary invites the community members and local business owners to attend school events. We intentionally encourage community members and business partners to participate on the School Advisory Council. We invite city officials to speak personally to students and parents and to participate in school celebrations. River Springs Middle School visits annually to speak to rising sixth graders concerning preparation for the middle school transition. Orange City Elementary administration and support staff effectively communicate the needs of our school community to stake holders and partners. In that way, we are able to secure needed resources to support student achievement. Dixie Larsen, family center paraprofessional, helps to coordinate events for families and provide continuous support.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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