The School Board of Highlands County

Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Park Elementary School

327 E PALMETTO ST, Avon Park, FL 33825

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~pes/

Demographics

Principal: Robert Germaine

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Highlands 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

Park Elementary School

327 E PALMETTO ST, Avon Park, FL 33825

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~pes/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Highlands 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.

Park Elementary's mission statement is: "Purposely Empowering Success."

Provide the school's vision statement.

Park Elementary's vision statement is: "Go Near and Far Leading Wherever You Are."

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Harvard, Zachary	Assistant Principal	
Germaine, Robert	Principal	
Rodriguez, LaCae	Reading Coach	
Pantoja, Maricarmen	Math Coach	
Barbour, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Hendrick-Robles, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	
Reed, Summer	Teacher, K-12	
Brown, Krystal	Teacher, K-12	
McGee, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	
Messer, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Free, Stacie	Teacher, PreK	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/22/2021, Robert Germaine

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
23

Total number of students enrolled at the school
480

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	82	79	64	74	65	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
Attendance below 90 percent	37	24	17	14	26	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	9	8	4	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	5	5	1	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	20	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	6	7	2	7	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	13	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/22/2021

2020-21 - 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	84	76	72	82	65	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	15	14	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	2	2	6	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	30	17	14	12	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in Math	22	9	11	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	11	6	9	5	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	18	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

2020-21 - 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	84	76	72	82	65	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	18	11	15	14	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	2	2	6	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	30	17	14	12	13	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in Math	22	9	11	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	11	6	9	5	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	18	6	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	50%	57%	43%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	54%	58%	44%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	49%	53%	41%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	57%	63%	47%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				47%	57%	62%	42%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				27%	44%	51%	35%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				33%	45%	53%	45%	52%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	53%	50%	3%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	49%	4%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	44%	45%	-1%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	73%	56%	17%	62%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	64%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	60%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	43%	-8%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

I-ready and M-class

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	23	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	15	26
	Students With Disabilities	7	5	6
	English Language Learners	4	2	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	22	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	16	22
	Students With Disabilities	9	6	7
	English Language Learners	2	3	4

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	29	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	20	26
	Students With Disabilities	5	7	8
	English Language Learners	0	1	2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	20	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	20	26
	Students With Disabilities	5	7	8
	English Language Learners	0	1	2

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	23	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	16	24
	Students With Disabilities	3	4	5
	English Language Learners	2	3	4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	25	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	18	27
	Students With Disabilities	2	6	5
	English Language Learners	2	7	6

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	30	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	15	19
	Students With Disabilities	2	5	6
	English Language Learners	1	1	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	26	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	15	17
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	3
	English Language Learners	2	3	3

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	29	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	16	15
	Students With Disabilities	5	8	7
	English Language Learners	3	4	3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	29	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	18	18
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	6
	English Language Learners	2	4	4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			58
	Economically Disadvantaged			53
	Students With Disabilities			56
	English Language Learners			60

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	33		40	17		50				
ELL	27	60		65	60						
BLK	21			41							
HSP	44	60		67	72		50				
MUL	70			70							
WHT	69	74		79	78		76				
FRL	38	54	50	58	61	40	54				

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	22	30	32	29	37	29	11				
ELL	40	40		65	47						
BLK	38	60		37	34	17	25				
HSP	49	58	56	58	47	29	30				
MUL	64			64	55						
WHT	56	62	50	68	56		39				
FRL	45	59	51	53	44	28	31				

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	9	15	13	14	18	17	9				
ELL	24	44		34	31						
BLK	33	29		33	43						
HSP	37	48	57	43	40	32	38				
WHT	53	47		59	47	27	60				
FRL	39	42	41	44	40	36	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA overall proficiency has decreased from 51 % to 49 %.
SWD ELA proficiency is at 29 %.
ELL ELA profiency is at 33 %.
BLK ELA proficiency 21 %.

Math overall proficiency has increased from 58 % to 64 %.
ESSA subgroups all score higher than 41 % in proficiency and gains.

Science overall proficiency has increased from 33 % to 63 %.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Overall ELA and ESSA subgroups proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We will need to use more fidelity and purposefulness interventions.

We will increase the purposefulness of targeted interventions, MTSS review, progress monitoring, and instructional pedagogy to address these needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math overall proficiency has increased from 58 % to 64 %.
ESSA subgroups all score higher than 41 % in proficiency and gains.

FSA Science proficiency has increased from 33 % to 58 %.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

1. Continued implementation of the PLC model for all subjects.
2. FSA Data from 20-21 will be used to target students for whole and small group instruction to achieve
proficiency and learning gains.
3. Students identified in the lowest 25th percentile will receive explicit, small group instruction.
4. More rigorous standard-based science instruction.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will increase the effectiveness of PLCs, purposefulness of targeted interventions, MTSS review, progress monitoring, standard-based instruction, and instructional pedagogy to accelerate learnings for all students.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Learning Communities held weekly.
Professional developments on relationship building.
Standard based lesson planning and targeted interventions used with fidelity.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Continuous evaluations to measure the effectiveness of PLC, targeted interventions, MTSS review, progress monitoring, and instructional pedagogy to address these needs.

Ensure we are using the most effective research-based strategies to build the capacity of all stakeholders.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on school grade data our FSA ELA proficiency decreased from 2019 to 2021 (51% to 49%) , but ELA lowest 25th Percentile showed an increase from 53% to 54%.
Measurable Outcome:	56% of the students will be proficient on ELA FSA by May 2022. 58% of the students in the Lowest 25th Percentile will make learning gains on the ELA FSA by May 2022.
Monitoring:	Standard based assessments, I-ready progress monitoring, MTSS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	LaCae Rodriguez (rodrigul1@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	FSA data is analyzed to determine targeted intervention groups for students in need of additional support to achieve learning gains. Through PLC's and coaching, the reading coach is working with teachers to improve staff capacity to plan, deliver, and monitor core instruction. Student work samples are also being analyzed to adjust instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The previous year's ELA FSA data showed an 2% decline. ELA lowest 25th Percentile showed a small increase from 53% to 54%. Intervention groups were determined using FSA, IReady, and Diagnostic 1 data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continued implementation of ELA PLC model.
2. FSA Data from 20-21 will be used to target students for whole and small group instruction to achieve proficiency and learning gains.
3. Students identified in the lowest 25th percentile will receive explicit, small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Robert Germaine (germainr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on school grade data our FSA Math proficiency increased from 2019 to 2021 (58% to 64%) , Learning gains from 47% to 66%, Lowest 25 from 27% to 53%.
Measurable Outcome:	70% of the students will be proficient in Math FSA by May 2022. 68 % of all students and 56% of the students in the Lowest 25th Percentile will make learning gains on the Math FSA by May 2022.
Monitoring:	Standard based assessments, I-ready progress monitoring, MTSS.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maricarmen Pantoja (pantojam@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Target intervention groups. Professional Learning Community to analyze data and improve staffs' capacity and pedagogy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The previous year's FSA data showed increases in overall proficiency, learning gains, and bottom 25 %. We are very pleased with this progress, but maintain high expectations for continuous improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continued implementation of Math PLC model.
2. FSA Data from 20-21 will be used to target students for whole and small group instruction to achieve proficiency and learning gains.
3. Students identified in the lowest 25th percentile will receive explicit, small group instruction.

Person Responsible	Zachary Harvard (harvardz@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We had subgroups of students with 10 or more absences. For this reason, we must decrease the absences to increase their instructional time to help close learning gaps.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase attendance for ESSA subgroups with 10 more absences by 10 %. Increase students' overall attendance with 10 of more absences by 10 %.
Monitoring:	We believe we can improve attendance for all students, including ESSA subgroups by; Pulling attendance reports weekly. Reaching out to students who are frequently tardy/absent. Reviewing attendance during MTTS meetings. Incentivizing attendance throughout the year. Going over attendance expectations with students weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Robert Germaine (germainr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will pull attendance reports weekly. Review attendance during MTTS meetings. Incentivizes attendance throughout the year. Go over attendance expectations weekly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We use these best practices to remind/reward students for meeting the school's attendance expectations. Additionally, regular attendance aligns with our vision of "Purposely Empowering Success".

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our rate is 1 incident per 100 students. This aligns with the state average. However, this is higher than the school's actual amount of incidents. Some incidents were miscoded, and we are working/waiting to get the incidents corrected due to initial miscoding. Additionally, our rate of suspensions is at 3, compared to the state average of 3.2. Due to these factors, we will improve our PBIS incentives and MTSS behavior plans to strengthen both of these incident indicators.

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.

Park Elementary is a PBIS Resilience school. We have been utilizing the PBIS model for 5 years. School wide expectations are taught and practiced in every classroom. A PBIS Team meets monthly to monitor discipline data, to plan incentives for students that demonstrate positive behaviors, and to share strategies that reinforce positive behaviors.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

In October 2019 our teachers attended a training with Rufus Lott III to learn the principles of Restorative Practices. As a result of this training, PES is focused on building and sustaining meaningful relationships with students. Every classroom develops a "Relationship Agreement" which is a social compact that is established through student and teacher collaboration. Teachers and students decide how they want to be treated and how they will treat others. This is signed by all students in the class and is an expression of the class' values.
Another way teachers work to build relationships with students is through the "relationship building" circle. This is a tool that helps the students and the teacher learn about one another, and it increases levels of empathy and understanding.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00