Chaffee Trail Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chaffee Trail Elementary

11400 SAM CARUSO WAY, Jacksonville, FL 32221

http://www.duvalschools.org/chaffeetrail

Demographics

Principal: Casie Doyle L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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)	86%
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 (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

Chaffee Trail Elementary

11400 SAM CARUSO WAY, Jacksonville, FL 32221

http://www.duvalschools.org/chaffeetrail

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	77%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

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 the basis for all students to become life long learners and well rounded citizens

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage all students in meaningful work, Empower them to become responsible for their own learning, So that they Excel as productive citizens.

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
Doyle, Casie	Principal	
Wright, Marquita	Assistant Principal	
Sherman, Katherine	School Counselor	
Slawson, Shauna	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Casie Doyle L

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.*
4

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

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)	86%
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 (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	12	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
One or more suspensions		2	1	1	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	6	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
	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	4	3	4	22	43	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135

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	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	119	116	118	132	117	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	16	14	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	0	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	119	116	118	132	117	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	16	14	12	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	4	1	1	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	0	3	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	53%	50%	57%	54%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	50%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	62%	63%	63%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	63%	62%	65%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	58%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	48%	53%	62%	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	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
	2018	50%	50%	0%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison	-3%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	54%	49%	5%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison	7%					
Cohort Comparison	11%					
05	2019	50%	50%	0%	56%	-6%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison	0%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	63%	61%	2%	62%	1%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	-8%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	64%	13%	64%	13%
	2018	65%	60%	5%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison	6%					
05	2019	67%	57%	10%	60%	7%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	60%	49%	11%	53%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
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	30	50	47	45	50	59	35				
ELL	33	30		42	50						
BLK	43	50	45	61	61	52	43				
HSP	36	31		56	62						
MUL	61	67		72	73						
WHT	67	59	67	81	75	73	76				
FRL	49	56	48	65	59	53	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	30	45	40	41	63	67	33				
ASN	80	60		90	90						
BLK	43	46	33	61	77	73	37				
HSP	57	90		67	55						
MUL	64	63		60	69		70				
WHT	62	57	50	82	75	70	71				
FRL	48	52	46	63	69	63	48				
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	22	44	38	33	53	48	35				
ASN	60			70							
BLK	45	53	48	52	62	67	53				
HSP	33	46		58	57						
MUL	56	53		79	81						
WHT	62	62	55	69	67	56	71				
FRL	45	51	44	55	57	60	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)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	51
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

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	68
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	71
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	55
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.

lowest 25% ELA- management of time spent on rti, and differentiating the use of whole group to meet the needs of groups of students rather than one size fits all.

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

Math Gains- plateau in curriculum growth....3rd grade scores dipped the most.

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 ELA proficiency had the largest gap when compared to the state it was 4 point difference. More students in primary grades struggling with basic letter and sound recognition and identification. While we have a phonics program in primary traditionally we haven't seen the transfer of those skills.

Consequently by the time they hit 3rd grade when we should have a focus on the practice of reading for information we are still spending a majority of our time working on the basic foundations of reading such a phoneme awareness and phonics.

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

ELA lowest 25% had the most improvement from School to State. The skills tend to be practiced in isolation in our curriculum and thus we create plans for implementing opportunities for the transfer of the practiced skills.

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

Student truancy is our biggest EWS concerns. When reviewing our Bottom 25% we find that many of these students also fall into our truancy category.

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

1.ELA Proficiency
2. Math Gains
3. Lowest Performing 25% in reading
4. Lowest Performing 25% in math
5. Truancy

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing students proficiency coming into 3rd grade.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase in over all ELA proficiency on FSA from 53% to 57%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terry Stuckey (stuckeyt@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Increased time spent in small group instruction, using corrective reading, LLI, and Freckles. Additional supports for individualized student achievement goals will be delivered with the assistance of our instructional coach, tutors and additional para supports, using LLi, Bartons, Reading mastery, etc . In addition, we will incorporate technology such as tablets, laptop cart, smart boards, etc into the delivery of instruction to increase engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Each student will be assessed and will be placed in the correct program based on their individual needs. Each program will have a monitoring component that marks growth or lack of.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher PD training - Corrective Reading, LLI, and Freckles
progress monitoring - Principal and Reading Coach
CLC data dives bi-weekly

Person Responsible	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Truancy - students missing more than 25 days in a school year.
Measurable Outcome:	We will reduce the number of students with less than 90% attendance from 6% to less than 3%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marquita Wright (wrightm3@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AIT meetings Students Success Conferences PBIS positive incentives for attendance
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Meeting with parents to discuss the obstacles they may be encountering that prevents student attendance and provide support to over come those obstacles. PBIS 9 weeks incentives that will promote better attendance school wide including on time arrival and early check outs

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increased achievement in math for our lowest 25%
Measurable Outcome:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our data on from 2019-20 Standards based dashboard shows a deficit in student ability to demonstrate their knowledge of the standard being delivered in the instruction as well as the task used to demonstrate students knowledge of the standard is often less than grade level/standard. The task often demonstrates minimal proficiency of the standard. Moving forward this year our goal is that Instruction will match depth, breadth and scope of grade level standard to ensure that student can show proficiency at grade level. Based on our standards walk through we found that while the teachers instruction covered the standard at grade level the assessment piece often did not align with the rigor of grade level standard. Our goal is three fold. We will plan in clc creating arcs for the standards to guide us in developing exit slips and formative that asses the standard at minimally a level 3 proficiency while giving students opportunities to stretch into levels 4&5. In addition, the goal is to promote students discourse around the standard during each portion of the lesson from start to finish. This student accountable standard based talk will be considered part of student feedback teachers will use when planning next steps for remediation and or reteach of a lesson. Finally, the work from CLC's Arc planning will create a safety net allowing us to asses exactly what students know or do not know at each point in the arc. This will tell us where they are in the work and what extra support in the standard they may still need via small groups in order to reach and or surpass proficiency of the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	All of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards based instruction planning procedures reviewing and designing assessment/task resulting in a rating of 1.5 or greater. Student accountable talk around the standard will increase to a vast majority on the rubric.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Meaningful CLC that produces lessons and formative's that ensures students are not only exposed to standards aligned instruction, but as well the task and assessments given to students will demonstrate the rigor of the grade level standard requirements minimally at a level 3 proficiency but ultimately with opportunities to demonstrate knowledge and performance at a level 4 or 5 level. Guiding questions that prompt student conversation that demonstrates meta cognition of the lesson and standard, will be a part of our clc planning session's product. Based on standard walk through tool, the admin team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experience.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly PLC meetings that allow for planning for alignment of instruction and task. This will include PD review of the ARC and using the ARC steps for planning out each standard in CLC planning time and team planning time. Lessons will result in an ARC in teachers plan as well as prompting and guiding questions to engage students in accountable talk around the lessons standard/purpose.

Person Responsible	Terry Stuckey (stuckeyt@duvalschools.org)

Admin - data chats and follow up conversations and next steps Monthly

| **Person Responsible** | Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org) |

Teachers and administration will engage in peer Walk Throughs to foster a collaborative approach between colleagues. This is an area of need in our 5E's survey more teacher corroboration.

| **Person Responsible** | Casie Doyle (crawfordc2@duvalschools.org) |

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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 continue to keep the remaining school wide improvements at the fore front of our thoughts in planning for the second half of the year through leadership team
The following committees will support this planning and follow up projects: Reading Committee, Math committee, STEERING committee

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.

We report out our data from the 5 E survey setting goals to improve each area of concern in the following stakeholder committee meetings in August :
STEERING Committee

PTA Family Night/PTA board meeting
SAC committee
CTES Leadership Team
Title I family students success family night

All of these stakeholder groups meet on a monthly basis for continued collaboration on goals and problem solving obstacles.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**	$0.00
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**