

Escambia County School District

Molino Park Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Molino Park Elementary

899 HIGHWAY 97, Molino, FL 32577

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Johnecheck D

Start Date for this Principal: 8/5/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Molino Park Elementary

899 HIGHWAY 97, Molino, FL 32577

www.escambiaschools.org

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	68%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Molino Park Elementary endeavors to prepare each student to be a lifelong learner and a productive citizen. We utilize current research-based educational principles and practices to facilitate maximum student performance.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Molino Park's vision is, "To promote joy in learning in a positive, safe and child-centered environment."

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
Barnes, Lisa	Principal	The School Leadership Team assists in identifying resources, setting school goals, and supporting grade level goals. Grade level chairs, ESE representative, special area representative, parent representative, assistant principal, and principal make up the Leadership Team. Each member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation. These members are also members of other Molino Park Committees so they can bring initiatives/areas of concern or need to be discussed during Leadership Team meetings. Discussions from these meetings also become part of the School Improvement Plan Areas of Focus. The team will use strategies from the School Improvement Plan for support of students and implementation of the plan.
Abrams, Gwen	Other	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Johnecheck, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	The School Leadership Team assists in identifying resources, setting school goals, and supporting grade level goals. Grade level chairs, ESE representative, special area representative, parent representative, assistant principal, and principal make up the Leadership Team. Each member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation. These members are also members of other Molino Park Committees so they can bring initiatives/areas of concern or need to be discussed during Leadership Team meetings. Discussions from these meetings also become part of the School Improvement Plan Areas of Focus. The team will use strategies from the School Improvement Plan for support of students and implementation of the plan.
Hatch, Rebecca	Instructional Media	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Gaylard, Justin	Teacher, K-12	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Venable, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Blackburn, Candice	Teacher, PreK	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Blackmon, Kaleigh	Teacher, K-12	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Gilmore, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Sims, Dawn	Teacher, K-12	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Sapp, Kate	Teacher, K-12	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.
Cutler, Florence	Teacher, ESE	Member gathers information/ideas from their team members and bring it before the team and disseminate decisions back to their areas of representation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/5/2020, Cheryl Johncheck D

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.*

3

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	78%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	91	82	61	90	64	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	18	11	9	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	
One or more suspensions	1	6	1	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	

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	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	7	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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	81	68	86	63	72	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	18	12	4	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	

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	2	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	2	2	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	

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	81	68	86	63	72	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	11	18	12	4	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	4	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	2	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	2	2	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	

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	64%	53%	57%	66%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	62%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	53%	52%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	57%	63%	71%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	60%	62%	59%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	51%	45%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	54%	53%	92%	50%	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	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%
	2018	65%	44%	21%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	55%	33%	62%	26%
	2018	80%	54%	26%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	58%	26%	64%	20%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	81%	55%	26%	60%	21%
	2018	78%	52%	26%	61%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	55%	21%	53%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	87%	55%	32%	55%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	46	44	35	73	64	60	55				
BLK	33	58		68	75						
WHT	66	60	50	87	77	63	79				
FRL	63	64	56	81	78	64	69				
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	50	45	48	57	75	84					
BLK	47			67							
WHT	73	65	60	84	83	80	88				
FRL	59	45	52	71	79	83	79				
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	41	70	64	47	59	50	92				
BLK	53			67							
WHT	69	63	56	71	60	48	90				
FRL	59	57	46	62	57	33	89				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	69
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	68
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.

For the 2018-2019 school year, our lowest performance was ELA Achievement in 3rd and 4th grade and ELA Lower Quartile Students With Disabilities. Over the past two years, these subgroups have decreased. On AP2 data for 2019-2020, our Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 37% and our African American/Black ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 31%. If our students continued to make steady progress, they would have been on track to be above the 41% satisfactory rate.

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

In 2017-2018, our math lower quartile was 84%. In 2018-2019, our math lower quartile was 63%. In 2018-2019, the amount of time teachers had to teach math to lower quartile students was a contributing factor. On AP2 STAR math data for 2019-2020, our math lower quartile had 16% that met the target and 55 % that were on track to meet the target. On AP3 STAR math data for 2019-2020, 77% of our students were at the proficiency level.

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.

In the 2018-2019 school year, we were above the state averages for all components. Our closet to state average was our ELA Lower Quartile-State 53%, Molino Park 54%.

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

Our Math Proficiency went from 81% to 85% and our ELA Lowest Quartile went from 50% to 54%. Our fourth and fifth grade teachers, Administration, and Data Teacher Leader monitored their students' data and learning gains. They knew how many gains each student needed to make. Our teachers used focus lessons to review student understanding of concepts and skills. Teachers and Administration have data chats with students. Our school focused on supporting small group instruction by using extra personnel. We hired a LTS to support our lower quartile groups in small group instruction. Our media specialist supported small group instruction as well. On the 2019-2020 STAR reading data, our proficiency achievement level went up 2% (AP2-59% AP3-61%). On the 2019-2020 STAR math data, our proficiency achievement level went up 2% (AP2-75% AP3-77%). We continued all of the actions listed above.

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

After reflecting our EWS data, our potential area of focus is attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase ELA Achievement
2. Increase ELA Lower Quartile Students With Disabilities
3. Increase ELA Lower Quartile
4. Increase Math Lower Quartile
5. Decrease Attendance Below 90%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

For the 2018-2019 school year, our lowest performance was ELA Achievement in 3rd and 4th grade and ELA Lower Quartile Students With Disabilities. Over the past two years, these subgroups have decreased. On AP2 data for 2019-2020, our Students With Disabilities ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 37% and our African American/Black ESSA subgroup had a proficiency achievement level of 31%. If our students continued to make steady progress, they would have been on track to be above the 41% satisfactory rate. Typically, our ELA Lower Quartile subgroup consists of students that are in our ELA Students With Disabilities subgroup as well. It is crucial that we identify these students and provide them with instructional needs.

Measurable Outcome:

Our ELA proficiency will improve by 5% for our students going from 64% to 69%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Barnes (lbarnes2@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Provide intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data, foundational reading skills seems to be a hindrance to reading comprehension. According to Assisting Students with Reading: Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse, intensive systematic instruction on foundational reading skills proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

To improve our intensive systematic instruction on foundational reading skills, our teachers will participate in a book study on The Reading Strategies Book: Your Everything Guide to Developing Skilled Readers by Jennifer Serravallo. Kim Gunn, Teacher on Special Assignment with the ELA department, will lead this book study. From this book study, our teachers will analyze STAR data, iReady data, DRA data, and classroom assessments to implement strategies for intensive systematic instruction on foundational reading skills. Administration, the Guidance Counselor, and the teachers will monitor student progress through discussion in data and RtI/MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible

Lisa Barnes (lbarnes2@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School Leadership Team will meet monthly. Our Data Teacher Leader and Administration will analyze math lower quartile data to determine students' instructional needs. Our administration will share the attendance data with the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team will discuss strategies on how to decrease number of students with attendance below 90%.

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.

Molino Park's vision is, "To promote joy in learning in a positive, safe and child-centered environment." Molino Park Elementary endeavors to prepare each student to be a lifelong learner and a productive citizen. We utilize current research-based educational principles and practices to facilitate maximum student performance. Our stakeholders (SAC, PTA, Leadership Team, Business Partners, Volunteers, Mentors, and our Families) play a key role such as providing feedback to our administration. As an example, our SAC members provide feedback on school improvement strategies. Molino Park's faculty, staff, and stakeholder strives everyday to build effective relationships, promote physical safety, address emotional needs of students, and provide individual academic support.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00