

Duval County Public Schools

J. Allen Axson Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

<http://www.duvalschools.org/jaa>

Demographics

Principal: Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

<http://www.duvalschools.org/jaa>

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	No	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

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 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.

To provide educational excellence to every student every day using the Montessori Method of instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life through the Montessori Method.

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
Robinson Vanhoy, Cecilia	Principal	To lead the school academically, financially and oversee all operations of the school building. Also, work with all stakeholders to ensure input into a successfully run school.
Roberts, Amy	Assistant Principal	To lead and support the school principal towards the schools yearly academic achievement goals. In addition, supporting all other goals: Social/Emotional, Safety, Fiscal, and overseeing all Building Operations.
Avera, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	4th & 5th Grade Lead Teacher/ Robotic Coach
Queniat, Isabelle	Teacher, K-12	Prek-k Teacher, Team Leader for Prek-k Teachers
Loschiavo, Sara	Teacher, K-12	1st-3rd Grade Team Leader
Budd, Tara	Other	K-5 Gifted Lead Teacher
Dubberly, Robyne	Teacher, ESE	ESE Lead Teacher, MRT Liaison
Pond, Sandra	Other	Resource Lead Teacher for Team
Sosa, Nancy	SAC Member	Nancy is Axson's SAC Chair
Bryson, Irene	School Counselor	
Forest, Carla	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy

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.*

25

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast

Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	97	83	83	69	74	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	10	23	15	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	27	37	22	13	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	19	11	2	2	3	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	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Monday 6/15/2020

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	98	85	83	71	74	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	3	8	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	3	15	11	14	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	7	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	98	85	83	71	74	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	3	3	3	8	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide assessment	3	15	11	14	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	1	7	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	85%	50%	57%	86%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	77%	56%	58%	68%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	50%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	62%	63%	87%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	63%	62%	70%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	51%	77%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	48%	53%	75%	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	90%	51%	39%	58%	32%
	2018	92%	50%	42%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
	2018	76%	49%	27%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
05	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
	2018	85%	51%	34%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
	2018	85%	61%	24%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	49%	32%	53%	28%
	2018	82%	56%	26%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	58	62	57	61	75	61	53				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	64	47		83	78						
HSP	81	76		85	82		73				
MUL	84	79		79	71						
WHT	89	87	73	85	79	50	91				
FRL	66	62	64	76	85		53				

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	50	46	50	47	36	54				
ASN	100	92		100	67						
BLK	63	58		77	53		73				
HSP	67	64		57	57						
MUL	79	52		79	61	50	80				
WHT	89	70	59	81	71	47	89				
FRL	70	60	71	64	55	44	53				

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	61	50	45	59	62	65					
ASN	85	73		85	73						
BLK	76	58		86	79						
HSP	88	73		83	55						
MUL	69	53		83	40						
WHT	91	70	67	89	75	90	83				
FRL	73	67	56	75	67	64	50				

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	75
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	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	61
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	95
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	68
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	79
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	78
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	79
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.

Axson dropped 1% in science in 2019. However, it is not the same set of students each year to strengthen science we have set aside focused time while GATE students are receiving services to work with students that need additional support in science. We have also created a Science Lab for 3-5 grade that is additional science than what is offered in the classroom. This year would have been its second year in operation so I was looking forward to see if we increased our FSA Science score data if the school system hadn't been closed due to the pandemic and Florida state wide testing cancelled for the school year.

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

We did not have any declines other than 1% drop in science in 2019.

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.

We performed higher than the district and state average in every category in 2019.

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

The areas with the highest percent growth for 2019 were ELA Learning Gains, 10%, Math Learning Gains, 14% and Math Lowest 25th Percentile 8%. We strategically schedule students with the best teacher fit to get the maximum performance. We also look at dynamics between students to ensure academic growth for all student in each classroom.

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

The areas of concern are our retained students and those students with two or more indicators for EWS.

The EWS indicates the need to identify and closely monitor these individual students to ensure academic growth and success. The five retained students we had this year were parent requests. The parent requests were primarily student maturity, age, COVID or medically treated anxiety.

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

1. ELA/Math Lowest 25%
2. ELA/Math Learning Gains
3. Science Achievement
4. ELA Achievement
5. Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of Focus: ELA Achievement Subgroup 2019, If the identified subgroups: SWD 58%, BLK 64% and FRL 66% increase to at least 70% Axson will increase overall ELA Achievement and close learning gap.

Measurable Outcome: To increase each identified subgroups by at least 5% or more to close the achievement gap.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) three times a week for identified subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This is a evidence based strategy that DCPS uses in Title 1 schools to increase literacy. This has a proven track record of success and has the potential to increase Axson sub group scores by 5% or more.

Action Steps to Implement

The following subgroups: SWD 58%, BLK 64% and FRL 66% will be given additional instruction using the LLI Kit to increase each subgroup overall growth by 5% or more. In addition the plan would be to give additional instruction by another teacher/reading interventionist and track student progress toward goal.

Person Responsible: Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Using the Standards-Based School Continuum Tool and Axson PLC work from 2019-2020 we will work on category 3. Standards-Based Planning and 4. Aligned Observations. The goal is to work on the continuum to achieve good to strong in the categories listed. The Standard Walk-through Tool showed that administrators rated Axson on assessing student learning from 4.1 out of 5.0.

Measurable Outcome: Administrators will see growth on Assessing Student Learning(work on learning ARC) and moving from 4.1 to 4.4 on the Standard Based Walk Through tool by January 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Quality instructional delivery aligned to grade level standards gives students the opportunity to participate in grade level appropriate tasks(standards based instruction with Montessori materials), assessments and prepare them for promotion.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In the Opportunity Myth it states that students should be given grade appropriate, standards aligned tasks, assignments and assessments to ensure they are prepared for the state assessments and grade level promotion.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly Common Planning.. Mrs. Vanhoy and Mrs. Amy Roberts will share responsibility to meet with PLC teams once a month to work on Assessing Student Learning on the Standards Walk-Through Tool. We will be using the Montessori Scope and Sequence for each grade level. Standards, Montessori works and district curriculum will be aligned for use in classrooms at all grade levels. During Monthly Common Planning sessions, AP & Principal will collaborate on training from the district to implement during common planning or Early Dismissal. The documentation will include: agendas, planning tools, district protocol documents, common planning documents created during the sessions.

Person Responsible Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

2. Standards Based Walk Throughs: Regional Administration, Administration and teachers will carve out time to observe Student Aligned Tasks and Student Assessments within the classroom setting. Data will be reviewed once a month by the admin team and best practices of colleagues and students will be shared and discussed in PLC.

Person Responsible Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

3. Fidelity to Montessori Method/Standards Based Instruction: During work-cycle, students will be given individual work plans that include targeted, aligned, differentiated instruction. Teachers will pull small groups to remediate based on student needs. This will include multi-aged grade level groupings based on data(baseline,teacher assessments,exit tickets,Achieve, I-ready, and Freckle).

Person Responsible Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

4. Accept regional professional development on task development within the Learning Arc Template to show alignment to standards.

Person Responsible Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The areas of concern are our retained students and those students with two or more indicators for EWS.

The EWS indicates the need to identify and closely monitor these individual students to ensure academic growth and success. The five retained students we had this year were parent requests. The parent requests were primarily student maturity, age, COVID or medically treated anxiety. The administration team and teachers will closely monitor students who fall into this category through data chats, PD, Standards Alignment work to Montessori materials and individualized work plans to ensure growth/learning.

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.

Using J. Allen Axson's Five Essentials Data our school is well-organized which is considered a very strong school culture/climate. The data indicates from 2019- 2020 that we have a supportive environment. We increased from 79 in 2019 to 98 in 2020. That is a 19 point growth and is considered very strong. Also, the student respondents rated Academic Personalism from 81 point in 2019 to 99 points in 2020 and that is a 17 point growth from the previous school year. Peer Support for Academic Work went from 87 points in 2019 to 99 in 2020. That is a 12 point increase from the previous survey in 2019.

Also in the Effective Leaders category teacher respondents rated each of the following categories higher in 2020 then in 2019. Instructional Leadership 2019, 66 points with a one point increase in 2020, 68. Program Coherence was rated 67 point with a one point increase in 2020 to 68. Teacher-Principal Trust increased from 51 points in 2019 to 53 points in 2020 which is a two point increase from 2019/2020. There were several areas where we were strong in academic engagement with a 29 point increase and Classroom Rigor increased by 37 point according to student respondents.

Overall the Leadership Team strives each year to listen to all it's stakeholders and implement strategies that continue to grow a strong school culture for J. Allen Axson staff, students and parents.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00