Deltona Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deltona Elementary School

2055 DELTONA BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34606

https://www.hernandoschools.org/des

Demographics

Principal: Debi Shellabarger

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 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 (46%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

> * 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 Hernando 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

Deltona Elementary School

2055 DELTONA BLVD, Spring Hill, FL 34606

https://www.hernandoschools.org/des

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	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hernando 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.

In Partnership with parents and the community Deltona Elementary School is:
Determined to provide
Outstanding educational
Values to
Empower
Students

Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Determination, Empowerment

Provide the school's vision statement.

ALL children WILL achieve at high levels.

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
Shellabarger, Debi	Principal	Oversees the implementation of the SIP with fidelity.
Sweeney, Julie	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal with overseeing the SIP with fidelity.
Casto, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	Assessment teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting all grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and reporting state and county (AP1, AP2, and AP3) data for continuous monitoring of students achievement.
Gracy, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Gill, Brooke	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Steele, Michelle	Other	Achievement Gap liaison
Iannaccone, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Roush, Cindy	Other	Resource teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting of MTSS data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings. Also responsible for obtaining and deciding individual targeted instructional paths for students based on state and county(AP1,AP2, AP3) data. Monitoring of students instructional paths for fidelity in accordance with state and district guidelines.
Gendron, Amy	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible coordinates and teaches social skills and provides counseling for the overall well being of all students. Also part of the Threat Assessment and SBLT Teams.
Hill, Kenneth	Teacher, ESE	ESE Resource and Team Leader responsible for overseeing the ESE department. The collection of data, the writing and monitoring of IEPs for Students with Disabilties subgroup.
Dibble, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
LaBarge, Carrie	Other	Title I Facilitator assists with the monitoring programs that are tied to areas of need based on data. The coordination of family and engagement activities and ensures that Federal Compliance and monitoring is being met.
Makohon-Lynch, Sophia	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.
Arledge, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Branscomb, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	Grade level teacher and member of the School Based Leadership Team responsible for obtaining and reporting grade level data at bi-weekly SBLT meetings.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/26/2020, Debi Shellabarger

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

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)	100%

2019-20 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 (46%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	141	144	132	136	115	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	791
Attendance below 90 percent	87	81	62	75	61	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
One or more suspensions	6	19	17	25	17	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	15	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	8	24	24	27	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	120	119	108	106	104	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	46	36	22	33	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	15	39	49	66	63	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	8	24	24	27	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	120	119	108	106	104	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	46	36	22	33	31	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	15	39	49	66	63	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	33	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79

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	8	24	24	27	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166

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	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	52%	54%	57%	56%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	53%	58%	53%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	52%	53%	52%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	55%	58%	63%	60%	63%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	57%	62%	57%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	59%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	54%	53%	59%	54%	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	57%	57%	0%	58%	-1%
	2018	57%	62%	-5%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	59%	-1%	58%	0%
	2018	50%	53%	-3%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	40%	52%	-12%	56%	-16%
	2018	43%	53%	-10%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
	2018	54%	67%	-13%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
	2018	48%	60%	-12%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	38%	54%	-16%	60%	-22%
	2018	32%	56%	-24%	61%	-29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	55%	-13%	53%	-11%
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	55%	-13%
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	18	21	28	20	26	28	9				
ELL	29	36		41	45						
BLK	32	57		36	43						
HSP	46	41	15	56	56	60	33				
MUL	75	62		63	54						
WHT	54	46	41	56	45	31	41				
FRL	52	47	45	54	52	44	43				
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	20	32	44	24	30	28	13				
ELL	56	67		38	27						
BLK	31	40		35	8						
HSP	58	53	53	47	26	27	33				
MUL	53			59							
WHT	53	49	41	48	29	24	46				
FRL	51	51	48	45	27	17	43				
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	27	37	40	36	49	58	29				
ELL	27	50		36	80						
BLK	47	58		47	33						
HSP	49	51	60	55	67	67	56				
MUL	60	50		73	50						
WHT	58	53	51	62	56	59	63				

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
FRL	55	51	54	59	55	57	56				

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	49
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
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	46
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	64
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	45
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	50
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.

In 2019 our bottom quartile in Math showed the lowest school-wide performance. Data from our last FSA performance was our bottom quartile in Math as well. We are seeing an overall trend with our Math bottom quartile, however, we did have a 15% gain in 2019.

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

In 2019 our fifth grade Science showed the greatest decline with 5% from the year before. We believe there was a lack of overall rigor with the core instruction in Science in the 2018-2019 school year.

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 from the 2019 FSA was Math that scored the lowest 25th percentile with a gap of -14%. Fidelity in core instruction.

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

The data component in 2019 that showed the most improvements was the Percentage of students making adequate progress in Math that showed a gain of 21%. Focused on the fidelity of core instruction.

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

Attendance and discipline are the two areas of potential concern. Specifically with students who are on a distance learning platform and eSchool learners. Also, students who are transitioning to brick and mortar and vice versa.

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

1. Achievement-Narrow and Bridge
2. Fidelity of Core Instruction.
2. Communication with Families.
3. Attendance/ Transitioning digital platform to brick and mortar.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All teachers will teach core curriculum with fidelity while engaging students in learning. ELA overall achievement 52%, Learning gains 47%, lowest 25% gains 44%. Math overall achievement 55%, learning gains 49%, lowest 25% gains 37%. Science 40%. Under performing group: SWD ELA achievement for SWD 18%, learning gains 21%, lowest 25% gains 28%. Math achievement for SWD 20%, learning gains 26%, and lowest 25% gains 28%. Science achievement for SWD 9%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increasing student engagement in the classroom will reflect an increase of percentage of students with disabilities meeting the 41% ESSA Federal Index. In addition 5% increase in overall student achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debi Shellabarger (shellabarger_d@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on Florida Standards Assessment proficiency scores professional development is needed to plan for the core curriculum areas. Planning should include teaching the standards in depth while discussing delivery to increase overall engagement of all students. Data chats and incentives for students are necessary to ensure all students show a documented increase on overall diagnostics scores.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities - Weekly 2. Student Work Analysis Protocol - Bi-Monthly 3. School Based Leadership Team- Bi-Monthly 4. Administrative Walkthroughs - Daily 5. Data Chats - Daily for teachers and administration will review with teachers monthly 6. Resource Teachers/Site-based Coaches - Modeling and professional development- Monthly

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase overall learning gains with students with disabilities meeting the 41% ESSA Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities will show an increase of 21% or greater learning gains on the FSA ELA and Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Steele (steele_m@hcsb.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students with disabilities scoring below grade level on diagnostic tests will be receiving extra reading and math remediation during specials three days a week by a highly effective teacher.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The CARES ACT allows us to offer teachers an extra class supplement to teach specific students who are not on grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will implement attendance incentive programs, increase walk-throughs, Professional development for instructional staff, and S.W.A.P. Grade levels will share lesson plans across all content areas on Google share drive for consistency with all Gen ed and ESE teachers.

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.

From the beginning of school, we begin to develop positive relationships and open communication between parents and teachers. School communication folders and agendas are used daily to communicate academic and behavioral progress daily. Parents are invited to participate in monthly virtual Title 1 Parent/

SAC Meetings. Parents and local community partners participate in various virtual Family Nights and school activities throughout the year. Community stakeholders such as Operation HEART felt and People Helping People provide weekend food services to our students as well. The Title 1 compact encourages and sets expectations between students, parents, and teachers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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