

Volusia County Schools

Friendship Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Friendship Elementary School

2746 FULFORD ST, Deltona, FL 32738

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

Demographics

Principal: Eidle Velez

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Friendship Elementary will empower ALL students to succeed by providing high quality, equitable, and positive educational experiences that build academic success and a foundation for life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement

Through inclusive collaborative practices, Friendship Elementary will create a safe, positive, supportive learning environment where each student is valued and empowered to reach their fullest potential.

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
Velez, Eidie	Principal	Principal: Lead or Head Coach for improvement of the school and instruction. Sets the mission & vision for the school and is responsible for monitoring the continued progress and growth of students and teachers. Ensures provided budget supports the needs of the students and the instructional & professional needs of the teachers. Ensures the school culture is positive and the learning environment is conducive to learning for all students.
Aivazis, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal is in support of the mission and vision and serves in the capacity or manager of operations overseeing facilities and student behavior. The assistant principal works with the principal as part of the school leadership team in an effort to help develop teachers, schedules and ensure teacher best practices to move the school forward.
Campbell, Dylan	Instructional Coach	The role of the Instructional Coach is to support and develop teacher best practice through the implementation of the coaching model. The IC models instructional best practices and support teachers toward developing their own plan for professional improvement. The IC also works closely with the Principal as a member of the SLT to provide professional development and to focus all practice toward improving overall instruction to meet established academic achievement.
McCoy, Becky	Teacher, K-12	Reading Intervention K-12 teacher works closely with students. They monitor the classroom, state and district data to develop a plan of improvement for students who struggle in reading. They provide students with targeted interventions to fill the existing gaps in the learning of these struggling students.
Shank, Robin	Teacher, K-12	The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targeted instruction utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student ongoing progress and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content.
Yonker, Michael	Teacher, K-12	The role of the teacher is to plan standards aligned instruction taking into account the specific needs of students and addressing these needs through targeted instruction utilizing resources and support staff to ensure continued progress. Teachers are responsible for developing students into critical thinkers who are 21st century ready. Teachers are responsible for student ongoing progress and development toward mastery of the standards in specific content.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Rodriguez, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	The ESOL Teacher is responsible for providing targeted intervention to ESOL students based on their LEP goals. The ESOL Teacher works to ensure students progress in their current grade level based on the support model. They make recommendations and modifications when the data collected shows the students are not successful with present practice.
Collins, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Teacher is responsible for providing targeted intervention to ESE students based on their IEP goals. The ESE Teacher works to ensure students progress in their current grade level based on the support model. They make recommendations and modifications when the data collected shows the students are not successful with present practice.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Eidle Velez

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

32

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	88%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	64	73	70	73	75	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	408
Attendance below 90 percent	11	7	9	12	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	3	2	1	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	3	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	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	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	59	74	65	71	75	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	6	13	11	12	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	3	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	59	74	65	71	75	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
Attendance below 90 percent	6	13	11	12	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	3	4	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	56%	57%	49%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	58%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	46%	53%	46%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	52%	59%	63%	55%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	47%	56%	62%	40%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	43%	51%	33%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	52%	57%	53%	44%	58%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	58%	-14%	58%	-14%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	54%	2%	58%	-2%
	2018	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	53%	60%	-7%	62%	-9%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	59%	3%	64%	-2%
	2018	46%	60%	-14%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	55%	-8%
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	56	67	24	33	25					
ELL	28	45		38	35						
BLK	45	56		32	21		25				
HSP	47	59	67	57	56	42	53				
WHT	51	54		58	55		67				
FRL	47	56	70	49	41	30	46				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	32	42	4	16	18					
ELL	43	44		44	41						
BLK	33	44		33	25		42				
HSP	50	54	73	60	50	40	35				
WHT	60	41		64	41		56				
FRL	46	40	38	52	37	20	45				

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	51
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
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	49
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 performance for Friendship was the learning gains of our Lowest 25% in Math. It was also the lowest for several of our subpopulations: SWD's, ELL & African Americans.

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

The greatest decline was the learning gains of the lowest 25% in Math. This decline was due to lack of student focus, lack of teacher clarity of the standards/progression, as well as lack of alignment and collaboration between our Instructional Support Staff & Gen Ed Teachers to support students appropriately.

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 math learning gains lowest 25% was 21 points below the state average. The factors that contributed to this gap was student engagement and alignment of standards.

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

The most improvement was shown in the learning gains of our lowest 25% in ELA. The factors that contributed to this can be attributed to focused data analysis, targeted small group reading intervention, feedback & PLC's.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data we identified that our two areas of concern are the number of Level 1's on the State Assessment, as well as the number of students with Attendance below 90%.

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

1. Math Lowest 25% related to learning gains.
2. ESSA Subgroups performance of our African American, ELL & SWD's in the areas Math & Science.
3. SEL as it pertains to Discipline and Attendance.

4. Math performance overall for all grades.
5. Maintain our ELA Lowest 25% learning gains at 65% or above.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our first area of focus is Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning. This was identified as an area of focus because we noticed a lack of teacher clarity on the standards as evidenced by the decrease in all areas of Math on the 2019 FSA, our Math Learning Gains were 13 percent below the state average. This was also noted during Learning Walks & PLC's.
Measureable Outcome:	The Learning Walks using the IPG will show that we have standards aligned instruction in 80% of classrooms observed as noted in Core Action 1. Also closing the achievement gap for our lowest 25% on District & State Assessments at a Federal Index of 45% or above. Weekly time for collaborative planning for cohesive & equity of instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our evidence based strategies will include: Professional Learning Community (PLC) strategies, using data from multiple sources and standards-aligned lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These evidence-based strategies were chosen based on their High Effect size of Collective Teacher Efficacy of 1.57. According John Hattie (2009), the best way for improving schools was to organize teacher collaborative teams that clarify what each student must learn and the indicators that the learning team will track, gathering evidence, ongoing data analysis, so that collaborative teams can analyze results for selecting instructional strategies that work best.

Action Steps to Implement

- Develop a systematic plan and calendar/schedule for Collaborative Planning Times.
Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)
- Determine Staff Development Needs by collecting teacher input.
Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
- Training on the PLC Cycle and Collaborative Planning Expectations
Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)
- Provide teachers with data, resources for analyzing data through the coaching model through Professional Development.
Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
- Learning Walks using the IPG or tool. Provide feedback to instructional staff.
Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)
- Meet with coaches to discuss and align resources to collaborative teams as needed.

Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Analyze school wide trends and adjust instructional practices as needed.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our second area of focus was Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math by providing evidence based practices that are aligned to the standards and have a focus on the progression through the five domains of math all students in targeted subgroups will achieve success.

Measureable Outcome: Increase lowest 25% learning gains from 30% to 45%.
Increase Math Learning Gains from 47% to 57%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Refine systematic practices and increase the knowledge of instructional strategies through coaching, modeling, sharing, and professional learning for implementation of focused standards aligned instruction and best instructional strategies to increase the math skills of all students in all 5 areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Expansion of best teaching practices to increase the percentage of students making learning gains in math.

Action Steps to Implement

Analyze Math Data from i-Ready Math Diagnostic 1.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Creation of Math Data Wall to analyze and monitor school wide trends.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop plan of action for professional learning and systematic practices for implementation.

Person Responsible Eidle Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Communicate plan and collect teacher input.

Person Responsible Eidle Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Provide teachers with data, resources for analyzing data and provide individual support through the coaching model.

Person Responsible Dylan Campbell (dbcampbe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor through Learning Walks, Quick Checks and Data Days.

Person Responsible Eidle Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our third area of focus was Culture and Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity. This was chosen as an area of focus to increase inclusive equitable practices for all subgroups.

Measureable Outcome: This will be measured by a decrease on our Early Warning Systems for Discipline & Attendance, which will then show an increase in academic achievement and engagement in all academic areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Inclusive Best Practices for Diversity & Equity.
District Based Staff to provide training.
School Counselor to provide SEL lessons for classroom use.
Differentiated Instruction, Tutoring & Intervention for students in identified subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale for the evidence based strategy is to train staff on Diverse & Equity Instructional Practices.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Early Warning System Data
Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify At Risk Students
Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop Monitoring Plans for Specific Students
Person Responsible Diana Dean (dcdean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Determine Staff Development Needs through Staff Survey's.
Person Responsible Diana Dean (dcdean@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Train Teachers on Staff Development Needs: Equity & Diversity; Inclusive Practices; Etc
Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Walkthroughs to monitor Social Emotional Learning in classrooms through the use of a monitoring tool.
Person Responsible Eidie Velez (evelez@volusia.k12.fl.us1)

Ongoing monitoring of Early Warning System.
Person Responsible Jessica Aivazis (jaaivazi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring of student survey's at the beginning, middle and end of the year.
Person Responsible Diana Dean (dcdean@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.

Another Area of Focus would be in increasing our positive school culture through an increase in Leadership opportunities for staff and students, positive incentives for staff and students and a systematic approach for a House System for engaging students.

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.

We at FES, will foster positive relationships with community, parents and families through our communication plan which includes newsletters, other paper-based literature, our connect calls and school-based family events. FES will also host several events throughout the year to which these parties are invited. At these events we showcase student work and what we do as a school community to promote academic, social and emotional and behavioral success. Our parental and community advisory boards (SAC/PTO) are other opportunities to have feedback from these stakeholders. We also have a parent liaison who will serve to build community involvement through the parent center. The liaison will work with parents to provide helpful support in assisting and educating parents on ways to support their child’s academic success. Through our Volunteer Coordinator FES will foster relationships with outside entities wanting to invest time in support of education through small donations or through mentoring of our students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------