

Escambia County School District

# Global Learning Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Global Learning Academy

100 N P ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.ecsd-fl.schoolloop.com

## Demographics

Principal: Lalla Pierce T

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: D (37%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

## Global Learning Academy

100 N P ST, Pensacola, FL 32505

www.ecsd-fl.schoolloop.com

### 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	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	93%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

The mission of Global Learning Academy is to help students become successful and responsible citizens in our diverse societies.

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

The vision of the Global Learning Academy is to create a school where everyone who enters is exposed to other cultures, excited to learn and free to explore in a safe and encouraging 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
Labounty, Judy	Principal	
Parker, Debby	Teacher, K-12	
Sheater, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Iser, Dian	Teacher, K-12	
Pierce, Lalla	Assistant Principal	
Adams, Kim	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 8/21/2020, Lalla Pierce T

**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.*

1

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

36

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: D (33%) 2015-16: D (37%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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



Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	45	79	75	87	97	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	467
Attendance below 90 percent	12	38	24	23	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	3	12	13	9	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	7	3	13	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	3	3	13	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

**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	6	6	13	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

**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	11	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/21/2020

**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	73	97	91	102	84	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	19	41	27	31	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	10	27	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	46	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

**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	7	5	16	25	15	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	10	13	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

**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	73	97	91	102	84	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	19	41	27	31	25	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	10	27	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	46	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	7	5	16	25	15	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	10	13	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

## 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	32%	53%	57%	28%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	55%	58%	41%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	52%	53%	33%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	27%	57%	63%	28%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	60%	62%	37%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	51%	41%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	54%	53%	26%	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	28%	56%	-28%	58%	-30%
	2018	19%	52%	-33%	57%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	56%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	28%	51%	-23%	56%	-28%
	2018	23%	44%	-21%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	17%	55%	-38%	62%	-45%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	58%	-22%	64%	-28%
	2018	33%	58%	-25%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	28%	55%	-27%	60%	-32%
	2018	16%	52%	-36%	61%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	55%	-11%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	55%	-11%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	13	37	30	21	44	56	19				
BLK	27	47	53	21	42	54	33				
HSP	38			57	50						
MUL	48	54		33	46						
WHT	58	50		63	56						
FRL	32	49	52	26	44	49	40				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	10	39	52	16	36	40	26				
BLK	22	37	46	25	37	36	36				
HSP	22	53		32	50						
MUL	33	33		40	50						
WHT	50	46		40	38						
FRL	25	40	48	28	40	38	42				
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	13	29	19	12	33	29	10				
BLK	24	40	37	23	33	36	21				
HSP	27	27		27	47						
MUL	41	45		45	64						
WHT	44	54		53	45		50				
FRL	26	40	32	25	36	42	24				

### 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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	293
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
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	40
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	48
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	45
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	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	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

ELA proficiency and learning gains was the lowest data component in the 18-19 FSA data and District progress monitoring data. Students with Disabilities was also the lowest data component with a 31% Federal Index. This has been a trend as many of GLA students have large gaps in their reading abilities.

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

ELA and lower quartile gains showed concerning decline. Unexpected teacher turn-over, a large number of novice teachers, and the need to adjust teaching positions to effectively fill vacancies negatively impacted instructional quality and continuity and therefore, gains.

**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 data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was proficiency rates for ELA and math. There was a 25 percentage point gap for ELA and 18 percentage

point gap for Math proficiency. This has been a trend over multiple years as many students at GLA have major learning gaps compared to students across the state. The school is working on closing this gap through focusing on student learning gains to bring them closer to proficiency.

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

Math lowest quartile gains went up 10% from the the 17-18 to 18-19 school year. GLA utilized the district math support for standard-based planning based on district progress monitoring data. Also, the use of i-ready, data analysis of unit assessments, and STAR data helped guide teachers on effective math instruction for for students.

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

One of the greatest areas of concern are the current 5th grade students that received a level 1 in 3rd grade during the 18-19 school year. Another major concern is absences for students. This is a concern because students are in different learning modes (traditional and remote) and are struggling with attendance during the COVID pandemic.

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

1. ELA proficiency and Learning Gains (with a focus on 5th grade students)
2. Math proficiency and learning gains (with a focus on 5th grade students)
3. Students with disabilities federal index (with a focus in Science and learning gains for 5th grade students)
4. African American student's federal index.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Over the course of Global Learning Academy's history ELA proficiency has been significantly lower than the state and ELA learning gains have also been below the state. Many of our students are reading at least one to two grade levels below their actual grade. This is true for many of our students but especially our African American subgroup. They had a gap of 30 percentage points in ELA proficiency compared to the state. With a focus on standards-based instruction driven by instructional data, Global Learning Academy believes this gap will begin to close.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Our ELA proficiency will increase 6 percentage points from 32% to 38%. Our ELA learning gains will increase 10 percentage points from 48% to 58%. Our African American ELA proficiency will increase 6 percentage points from 27% to 33%. Our African American ELA learning gains will increase 11 percentage points from 47% to 58%. Our Students with Disabilities ELA proficiency will increase 7 percentage points from 13% to 20%. Our SWD ELA learning gains will increase 10 percentage points from 37% to 47%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Judy Labounty (jlabounty@ecsdf.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Utilize the formative assessment cyclical process of progress monitoring to establish learning goals, adjust instruction, give feedback to students, and assist students in adjusting their learning behavior.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	According to 2018-2019 FSA data and district progress monitoring data for the 2019-2020 school year, students are performing below grade level in the area of reading. According to 10 Keys Policies and Practices for Assessment in Schools (research conducted by the Meadows Center- College of Education), utilizing the formative assessment cyclical process of progress monitoring shows a high correlation to increased student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide professional development to teachers on formative assessments utilized (STAR, i-Ready, District Unit assessments, Study Island).
2. Administer STAR quarterly and on-going unit assessments to students and identify student progress and set up student goals.
3. Provide planning and implementation support for standards-based instruction based on initial assessments, and provide professional development with district and SREB and conduct coaching cycles on implementing the formative assessment cycle.
4. Conduct data meetings with grade levels to discuss performance, trends, and adjustments that need to be made.
5. Conduct data chats with students and parents to give feedback on progress on a regular basis.
6. Utilize SRA and i-Ready to support students that are showing learning gaps based on the formative assessment cycle.
7. Utilize ESE teachers to work with students who are performing below grade level based on the formative assessment cycle.
7. Continue with this process throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible** Judy Labounty (jlabounty@ecsdf.us)



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

<b>Area of Focus</b>	Math proficiency and learning gains has been below the district and state for multiple years.
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	It improved from the 18 to 19 school year on the FSA but it is still significantly below where it should be.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Math proficiency will increase by 10% going from 27% proficient to 37% proficient. Math learning gains will also increase by 10% going from 44% to 54%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Judy Labounty (jlabounty@ecsdf.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students and teachers will use explicit instruction when introducing new math content. This will include teachers modeling math problems step-by-step. Students participate in guided practice with the teacher and independent practice with teacher feedback. Teachers design planned and organized lessons, ask the right questions, require frequent student response, and provide affirmative and corrective feedback.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	According to 2018-2019 FSA data and district progress monitoring data for the 2019-2020 school year, students are performing below grade level in the area of reading. According to 10 Key Mathematical Practices for Elementary Schools (research conducted by the Meadows Center- College of Education), utilizing differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students shows a positive effect size on increasing student performance.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Admin and teachers review student data for traditional and remote learners to determine learning levels of students.
2. Teachers work with district specialists, SREB, and admin to develop standards-based lessons that incorporate tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 instruction.
3. Students will utilize i-Ready for differentiated supplemental math instruction to address individual learning gaps.
4. Teachers will provide small group instruction to differentiate instruction for grade-level content.
5. Students will take standards-based assessments.
6. Students, teachers, admin, and district will review student data to conduct data chats with students, make instructional corrections, and develop review lessons to close gaps for students.

**Person Responsible** Judy Labounty (jlabounty@ecsdf.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The school is focusing on supporting health protection measures for students, teachers, and families for COVID-19. The school has implemented a mask requirement, taking temperatures of all staff and school visitors, and the school has limited outside visitors from coming on campus to protect those on campus. The school is also working on attendance and technology implementation for remote and traditional learners.**

## 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.

Our mantra is "Success: Whatever it Takes!" and this year, our focus is: "Our future is LIMITLESS." Teachers, students, parents, and community stakeholders hear and see this phrase often as we share it in our guiding documents, on our web page, Facebook page, and throughout our day. Each person at GLA goes above and beyond to put this mantra in action so that all constituents see we are a team working together for student success.

General guiding principles as a PBIS school also play into the positive school culture we build with our team. Our P.A.C.T. (Practice Honesty, Accept Responsibility, Choose Respect, and Think Safe) is communicated often and students are reminded of its importance using the Capturing Kids' Hearts four questions: What are you doing? What are you supposed to be doing? Are you doing it? What are we going to do about it?

Ways we involve all stakeholders and build a positive school culture includes the following:

Students are the focus of everything we do and we involve them in ownership of their education. Parents are invited to be full participants, this year more than ever, in their child's learning. We have frequent communication with parents and always let them know, "We are willing to do whatever it takes for your student's success."

Faculty and Staff are given opportunities for training and professional development, asked to share expertise with one another, and are often thanked in specific and meaningful ways because we value their expertise and voice that is so important to our team efforts.

Community Stakeholders continue to be pivotal to our success and positive culture as they support our efforts, even during this unique year. Community stakeholders are involved through Partners in Education, SAC Committee, Mentoring, Volunteering, and less formal avenues (such as our Facebook Page) as they seek to understand our needs and offer support. Even though Community Involvement is modified due to COVID-19, its importance and the value of their involvement can't be overstated.

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

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