
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	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Tomoka Elementary School

999 OLD TOMOKA RD, Ormond Beach, FL 32174

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

Demographics

Principal: Julie Roseboom

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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

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

Provide the school's vision statement

Tomoka: Encourage. Empower. Engage.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

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

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Julie Roseboom

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

50

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	55%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	91	91	87	71	94	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	536
Attendance below 90 percent	4	13	6	6	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	2	7	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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	8	5	10	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	56%	57%	70%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	58%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	53%	39%	39%	48%
Math Achievement	76%	59%	63%	77%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	72%	56%	62%	63%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	43%	51%	56%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	68%	57%	53%	73%	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	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
	2018	71%	56%	15%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	54%	18%	58%	14%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	70%	54%	16%	56%	14%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	67%	56%	11%	53%	14%
	2018	72%	56%	16%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	33	20	35	40	30	14				
ELL	92	70		100	100						
ASN	94	69		94	100						
BLK	36	43	20	51	65	54	48				
HSP	69			62							
MUL	64			57							
WHT	75	70	47	81	71	59	73				
FRL	62	59	33	68	69	56	63				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	32	46	41	42	33	35	38				
ELL	64			91							
ASN	95	82		90	71						
BLK	37	46	35	45	50	50	61				
HSP	20			80							
MUL	61	54		67	62						

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
WHT	77	59	37	82	66	61	77				
FRL	59	58	41	66	61	57	68				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	519
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	86
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	89
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
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	59
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 Learning Gains in Lowest Quartile @ 40% on FSA 2019
-Tier 1 instructional challenges

-PST process/progress monitoring

-Small group inconsistencies

2020 Data: IReady Lowest Quartile, Tier 3 shows a growth from 18% to 9% scoring at risk for Tier 3 (2 yrs or more below level) Tier 2 went from 63% to 53% shows a growth in At Risk for Tier 2 (1 yr below grade level)

18% to 38% scoring on grade level

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

Science Achievement: -5% change in 2019

-Limited hands on and exploratory science learning activities

2019-2020 5th Grade SMT Data shows we were at an average of 52.4% and then SMT 2 data was 72.8%

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

2018-2019 The greatest gap between Tomoka Elementary and the state, appeared when analyzing third grade high performing students earning a level 3 or higher. We dropped 9 points (62%) in that category while the state gained 1 point (58%), of third grade students passing ELA with level 3 or higher.

2019-2020 Due to Covid, School Closures prevented students from taking the State Assessment, FSA. Tomoka, and Volusia County Schools, have no other assessments taken that compare our data to the state.

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

19-20 Students that attended the 3rd grade ELA tutoring had a Median score of 152% of Annual Typical Growth in IReady Reading. 4th Grade students that attended ELA tutoring had a median score of 155% Annual Typical Growth on IReady Reading, and 5th Grade students who attended ELA Tutoring had a median score of 119% Annual Typical Growth.

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

Tomoka needs to increase student attendance for those students chronically absent, falling below 90% attendance rate. Tomoka also needs to focus on decreasing the number of students that repeatedly get Office Discipline Referrals.

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

1. Students with Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup: (increase to 41% or higher; collaborate with ESE team)
2. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains: (increase to 41% [43%] or higher; Teacher-led small group instruction)
3. Social Emotional Learning (SEL): (<15% of express feeling angry/afraid/lonely at school; implement PBIS)
4. Black/African American Subgroup: (increase beyond 45% or higher; provide opportunities closer to home)
5. Math Achievement and Learning Gains: (increase Gr. 3-5 math performance; understand rigor of standards)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

As a result of our Needs Assessment and analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 69%, ELA Learning Gains was 66%, but our ELA Lowest Quartile performed at 40%, which was below the district and state average. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in order to improve ELA Learning Gains and overall proficiency for all students. Further analysis revealed that many of the students in our Lowest Quartile were also in our two targeted ESSA subgroups: SWD (28%) and Black/ African Americans (45%) that performed near or below 41%.

Measureable Outcome:

Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 40% to 42% or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teacher-led differentiated small group instruction and targeted data driven reading intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. Fl. Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling readers in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review the Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for interventions, and support for SWD.

Person Responsible

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

2. Facilitate professional learning on ELA Wonders taught with fidelity, including small group instruction.

Person Responsible

Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Administer IReady diagnostic to establish baseline data.

Person Responsible

Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Conduct monthly PLCs for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions.

Person Responsible

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

5. Conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings with ESE and General Education Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible

Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Conduct "Team Time" sessions monthly focused on developing teachers' knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction; including following ELA Weekly Planners

Person Responsible Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Create coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction (ELA Wonders).

Person Responsible Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Conduct 2 Learning Walks with instructional coach and selected teachers during ELA Wonders small group instruction

Person Responsible Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

As a result of our Needs Assessment and analysis it revealed that our SWD subgroup's ELA Proficiency was at 27%, their ELA Learning Gains was 33%, and their ELA Lowest Quartile performed at 20%. These scores are well below the 41% target in one or more areas of the school report card. Our SLT decided to focus on ELA Instruction in order to improve learning gains and overall proficiency for our SWD subgroup. Further analysis revealed that many of the students in our SWD subgroup were also in our two targeted ESSA subgroups: Lowest Quartile (40%) and Black/African Americans (45%) that performed near or below 41%.

Measureable Outcome:

Increase our ESSA SWD Subgroup to 41% or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

Organize Collaboration time for ESE and General Education teachers to plan differentiated instruction and accommodations for the SWD in all classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to meta-analysis, (Teacher collaboration and achievement of students with disabilities: "A review of the research" - by Chris Mattatal and Keith Power), research supports collaboration between general and special education teachers as a means to improve teachers' instructional practice and to improve student outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review ESSA Subgroup data and rationale for working collaboratively with the IEP Team to improve teachers instructional practice and student outcomes.

Person Responsible

Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Facilitate professional learning on IEP/504 Accommodations and interventions. ESE teachers will be trained in SDI. Together, they will learn how the ESE teacher provides the SDI (high quality specially designed instruction) and then plan together how/what accommodations will support the learning in the classroom.

Person Responsible

Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Monitor implementation of accommodations and interventions (e.g. via checklists, notes in gradebook, and/or notes in plan book)

Person Responsible

Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

4. Monitor documentation of collaboration between general and special education teachers via consultation logs, support facilitation log, and/or emails.

Person Responsible

Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Administer district assessments (e.g. IReady, mid-year ELA, End of year ELA, VMTs, SMTs and VST and additional Progress Monitoring District Assessments and Volusia Writes) following the district testing calendar.

Person Responsible Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Conduct PLCs monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions.

Person Responsible Lynne Stephenson (ldsteph1@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Highlight and share UDL strategies during PLCs and faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Facilitate and support professional learning of ELA and Math curriculum.

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

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Roseboom (jrosebo@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of PBIS and Sanford Harmony

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

Action Steps to Implement

1. Introduce and review school-wide PBIS strategies and behavioral expectations along with discipline and student survey data.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

2. Implement school-wide PBIS common language and procedures within each classroom.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Implement professional learning on Sanford Harmony and effective SEL strategies for use within the classroom setting.

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

4. Conduct monthly PBIS committee meetings to review discipline data and school-wide strategies.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

5. Share quarterly discipline and attendance data at faculty meetings.

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

6. Conduct one to two student voice surveys to monitor feelings of anger, fear, and loneliness.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

7. Review PBIS, SEL, and student-generated topics on school news program quarterly.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

8. Review student survey results at faculty meetings.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

9. Implement professional learning on working with students with Behavioral Improvement Plans and related strategies.

Person Responsible Amy O'Quinn (anoquinn@volusia.k12.fl.us)

10. Walk-throughs will be conducted to observe the use of SEL Strategies and data shared out at PLC meetings to provide feedback.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

4. Black/African American Subgroup: (increase beyond 45% or higher; provide opportunities closer to home)

A tutoring program was initiated to be held at facilities closer to the students' homes so that they could participate after school and on weekends. A mentoring program was set up to build confidence and success. Cultural/Diversity trainings will be scheduled with Nick Prince and focus on Restorative Practices.

5. Math Achievement and Learning Gains: (increase Gr. 3-5 math performance; understand rigor of standards) Planning and implementation of tutoring groups before/after school hours; to increase Math small group instructional time for our Lowest Quartile students, including our SWD and African American subgroups.

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.

Tomoka Elementary has a very active PTA and SAC and values the input from these members. Tomoka shares school-wide information through our school website, Twitter, and Facebook, including special events, awards, and student celebrations. The school incorporates PBIS, a Positive Behavioral Initiative System, to encourage students to follow school-wide behavior expectations. Tomoka hosts a Cultural Awareness Celebration where classes research and celebrate diversity. This year, due to Covid-19 precautions, visitors/volunteers will not be permitted on campus to reduce the spread of germs.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00