Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

http://www.duvalschools.org/sheffield

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Delay N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Duval 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

Louis S. Sheffield Elementary School

13333 LANIER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32226

http://www.duvalschools.org/sheffield

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 KG-5	No	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Sheffield Elementary School's mission is to provide educational excellence at our school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sheffield Elementary School's vision is a community working together to inspire and prepare all students for success in college or a career and in life

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
DeLay, Cassandra	Principal	
Person, Dashan	Assistant Principal	
Weber, Monica	Assistant Principal	
Gilyard, Jeanna	School Counselor	
Sterner, Brooke	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Cassandra Delay N

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
59

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	142	120	111	119	127	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	23	14	15	21	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	3	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	54	65	63	38	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	64	81	66	56	23	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	316

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	52	59	57	40	16	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	244

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/5/2020

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	146	126	107	119	128	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	771
Attendance below 90 percent	24	30	23	29	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	25	51	42	56	66	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307

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	17	22	22	31	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	3	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	146	126	107	119	128	145	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	771
Attendance below 90 percent	24	30	23	29	24	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	152
One or more suspensions	2	6	4	5	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	25	51	42	56	66	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	307

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	17	22	22	31	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	3	5	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	62%	50%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	61%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	50%	53%	60%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	62%	63%	68%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	73%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	62%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	48%	53%	73%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	58%	50%	8%	56%	2%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
	2018	66%	59%	7%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	64%	9%	64%	9%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	62%	57%	5%	60%	2%
	2018	67%	61%	6%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	64%	49%	15%	53%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	56%	17%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison	-9%					
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	28	37	45	40	53	41	37				
ELL											
BLK	51	48	29	58	59	44	56				
HSP	71	78		77	74						
MUL	70	73		81	73						
WHT	65	63	60	71	62	37	72				
FRL	53	57	47	51	57	44	58				
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	23	38	38	40	60	56	30				
BLK	51	56	43	67	66	57	57				
HSP	70	62		74	69		76				
MUL	70	62		74	62		90				
WHT	60	52	46	75	66	48	81				
FRL	53	54	50	64	67	51	67				
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	56	60	38	69	60	55				
BLK	45	62	67	56	76	70	65				
HSP	64	63		67	59		85				
MUL	80	71		75	71						
WHT	58	58	58	73	74	52	74				
FRL	48	54	56	64	74	60	61				

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	60

ESSA Federal Index	
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	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	64
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	49
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	75
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	74
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	61
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	52
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.

SWD sub-group shows the lowest performance. This sub-group has significant academic deficiencies and many are working multiple grade levels below their current grade level.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline for the 2018-2019 school year. Our fifth grade students in 2018-2019 were 8% lower in science proficiency than our fifth grade students from the previous 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.

Our greatest gap was in math LPQ. Sheffield Elementary was at 45% while the state was at 51%. This is an area of increased focus and we will be implementing and tracking monthly student data in order to assess effectiveness of instruction and curriculum. Many of our students have gaps in their

learning and while they are making growth, it is not enough to show gains on a grade level assessment.

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

At Sheffield Elementary, our ELA LPQ showed the largest growth with an increase of 5% from 2018 to 2019. Our school had a priority focus on these students and we were very intentional with our actions last year. All of our ELA LPQ received instruction in LLI last year.

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

Reflecting on our EWS, our SWD sub-group is a potential area of concern for our school.

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

1. Increase in proficiency in the SWD sub-group.
2. Increase in learning gains in Math.
3. Increase in LPQ gains in math.
4. Increase "Teacher Principal Trust" measure within the 5 Essentials survey.
5. Increase "Safety" measure within the 5 Essentials survey.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on previous year Standards Walkthrough data, less than 40% (0.8 out of 2.0 on the dial) student learning tasks were aligned to the instructional delivery. We will focus on the learning ARC to ensure learning tasks and assessments are aligned to the standard. Through full implementation of learning ARCs, aligned tasks and assessments, student performance in all academic areas will increase.
Measurable Outcome:	All of LSE's current KG-5 teachers will engage in successful standards based instructional planning, development and implementation of learning ARCs during administratively led common planning and PLCs, ensuring the tasks and assessments meet the full rigor and depth of the standard. Through doing this, the student task alignment area on the Standards Walkthrough tool will increase by 1.0 (from 0.8 to 1.8).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will be done with teachers focused on standards-based tiered instruction. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the quality and fidelity of tiered instruction, as well as student tasks and assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The above strategies have been selected through the evidence presented in last year's Standards Walkthrough data. We will use the Standards Walkthough Tool to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilizing resources and reports from Standards Based Walkthrough data.

2. Analayze student work and assessment data to ensure the tasks are aligned and assessment are aligned to the standard.

3. Learning ARC that are developed during common planning and PLCs.

4. Frequent classroom walkthroughs using the SWT.

5. Quarterly data chats with administration will focus on student growth through the implementation of the learning ARC, tasks and assessments. We will reflect on implementation and focus on tiered instruction.

6. Professional Development based around standards based instruction and alignment.

7. There will be collaboration across the grade levels to ensure that teachers are aligning their tiered instruction based on the previous grade levels ARC.

Person Responsible Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 5 Essentials survey, Teacher Principal Trust was the lowest measure in the Effective Leader category. It scored at 38 weak and decreased by 2 from the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	If Teacher Principal Trust increases, then the Effective Leaders domain, will increase on the 2020-2021 5 Essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with effective leader ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust, they will more consistently be able to support each other and students.

Action Steps to Implement

• Weekly newsletters (Panther Post)
• Daily Debrief
• Open door policy
• All faculty members have Principal cell phone numbers
• Immediate response to email, phone and text
• Monday Morning Surveys to faculty
• Quarterly check-ins with teachers individually (just the principal and the teacher); monthly with teachers that have asked for more
• Providing more opportunities of leadership roles for the teachers

Person Responsible	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 5 Essentials survey, Safety was the lowest measure in the Supportive Environment category. It scored at 36 weak however, it did increase by 4 from the previous.
Measurable Outcome:	If Safety increases in students, then the Supportive Environment domain, will increase on the 2020-2021 5 Essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schools with higher safety ratings tend to provide opportunities for students to feel safe and also voice their concerns.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If the school is able to provide an environment where students feel safe, students will be more focused on their academic learning.

Action Steps to Implement

• PBIS for all areas of the school
• Positive referrals for bus behavior
• Bus of the Week
• Safety assemblies
• Monthly Drills (Different times of the day and different areas this year)
• Monthly Safety and referral updates with teachers
• Monthly PBIS meeting
• Quarterly PBIS Newsletters (teachers and parents)
• Students request individual counseling
• Teacher counseling referrals
• Conduct focus group interviews with 4th and 5th grade students at the beginning of the 2nd and 4th nine weeks to get students to view their perception of safety throughout the different areas of campus and among their peers, faculty, and staff. Safety ambassadors and restorative practice groups with students in 3rd – 5th.
• Through the PBIS Team create strategies/events/activities for students (dependent on student feedback from focus groups) that promote safety and teach students about safety around campus. Strategies are to include student suggestions from focus groups.

Person Responsible   Cassandra DeLay (delayc@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

These additional areas will be addressed through grade level leads, shared decision making, content area experts, school advisory counsel, PTA, faith based partners and other stakeholders.

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.

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, and responsibility. We will do this by providing opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through certain events such as Family Movie Nights, Family Dances, Math Night, Literacy Night, Student Conference night etc.. These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners as well as our faith-based partners.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: School Safety	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00