

Duval County Public Schools

Chimney Lakes 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Chimney Lakes Elementary School

9353 STAPLES MILL DR, Jacksonville, FL 32244

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

Demographics

Principal: Marianne Lee

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (69%) 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Chimney Lakes Elementary School

9353 STAPLES MILL DR, Jacksonville, FL 32244

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

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	Yes	85%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Chimney Lakes Elementary School is to enrich and broaden students' awareness of other cultures, which will prepare them to become college and career ready through valuable learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Chimney Lakes Elementary is a professional team committed to providing children the opportunity to develop a continual love of learning through a secure and encouraging atmosphere in which daily success is met, diversity is appreciated, and discovery allows for student involvement and achievement.

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
Gilley, Bill	Principal	Facilitator
	Assistant Principal	Kimberly Seibert and Nichelle Smith (neither name was found in the pull down menu)

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/23/2020, Marianne Lee

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (69%) 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	125	178	165	164	188	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	975
Attendance below 90 percent	1	48	23	25	33	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	1	8	9	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	8	2	0	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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 6/23/2020

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	176	168	180	200	148	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1056
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	15	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	23	11	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	8	14	8	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	17	10	10	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	7	2	0	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	176	168	180	200	148	184	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1056
Attendance below 90 percent	0	35	15	17	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	4	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	23	11	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	8	14	8	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	17	10	10	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	7	2	0	14	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	61%	50%	57%	63%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	56%	58%	67%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	53%	61%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	62%	63%	77%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	63%	62%	76%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	76%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	48%	53%	61%	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	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%
	2018	63%	49%	14%	56%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	61%	-1%	62%	-2%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	64%	20%	64%	20%
	2018	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
05	2019	65%	57%	8%	60%	5%
	2018	72%	61%	11%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	49%	1%	53%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	56%	13%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
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	32	52	58	39	57	43	25				
ELL	48	94	91	52	69						
ASN	82			91							
BLK	49	60	64	60	62	51	34				
HSP	60	71	80	74	69	71	64				
MUL	72	72		86	63		71				
WHT	72	53	39	80	72	60	65				
FRL	56	61	64	63	64	53	46				
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	31	49	47	43	51	42	48				
ELL	22	67	55	67	47						
ASN	83			92							
BLK	55	60	50	59	57	39	59				
HSP	53	58	56	72	62	53	65				
MUL	68	63		75	70						
WHT	73	58	67	82	66	63	84				
FRL	58	58	54	66	60	45	64				
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	42	56	68	61	70	74	52				
ELL	50	63	64	63	84						
ASN	78	79		83	64						
BLK	49	59	60	65	70	68	47				
HSP	58	61	59	78	83	78	57				
MUL	81	75		88	87						
WHT	77	74	65	88	80	90	74				
FRL	55	62	55	69	76	78	53				

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	62
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	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	70
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	87
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	54
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	70

Hispanic Students	
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	73
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	63
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	59
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.

Fifth Grade science had the lowest percentage of students proficient. Two new teachers were teaching science.

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

Fifth grade dropped by 19%. Two new teachers were teaching science.

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.

Fifth Grade ELA had the greatest gap at 55. there were two three man teams resulting in fewer minutes for ELA. We Have addresse this by having no three man teams.

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

Fourth Grade math imporved by 8% points.

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

Number of students with attendance issues and the number of students scoring at a level 1 in fifth grade.

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

1. Increase standard based instruction based on the rigor of the standard was low.
2. ELA and Math growth in fifth grade on the FSA.
- 3.
- 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:	Instruction will match the depth, breath, and scope of the grade level standards to ensure that students can show proficiency at grade level. Based on our Standard Walks we found that teachers struggled with creating lessons that aligned student tasks to the rigor of the grade level standards. While some lessons fell on the standard arc, most standards were not taught to mastery. There is a disconnect between what is observed and what is perceived based on comparing the data from the Standard Walk Through Dashboard and the result from the 5 Essential Survey.
Measurable Outcome:	At Chimney Lakes the Standard Aligned tasks will increase by 100% from 0.7 to 1.4 on the Student Task Alignment Dial on the Standards Walk Through Dashboard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Chimney Lakes teachers will collaboratively plan during PLC's to create learning plans and learning arc of a standard ensuring that standards are taught so that students can show mastery. Teachers will develop exit ticket and assessments that determine mastery of the lessons/standards taught. Teachers will be provided supplies, through Title One funding, in order to create charts, handouts, and print outs to bring the planning to life within the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Chimney Lakes used the Standards Walk Through Rubric and Standards Walk Through Dashboard to collect data based on standards based instruction during the 2019-2020 school year. The school data will be shared with teachers during PLC and faculty meetings in order to drive our work during our PLC's.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule that ensures a dedicated PLC time for each grade level and department.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

Train teachers on how to create a Learning Arc based on specific standards. Provide differentiated professional development for teachers.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

Schedule paraprofessionals, reading interventionists, and math interventions for grade levels to support implementation on lessons that are on the learning arc.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

Provide quarterly TDE for teachers to work on creating standards-based learning arcs for grade level standards.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

Administration will be trained by district level support staff in order to train teachers on the standards-based learning arcs. This includes monthly Principal PLC's and visits with partner school. Along with weekly meetings with Chimney Lakes administrative team in order to calibrate and discuss next steps.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Chimney Lakes will create a tier system using the standard arcs developed to show where on the continuum a lesson falls. (Example: Tier one - beginning/introduction Tier Two- specific pieces of the standard Tier Three- Completion of standard/ending assessment). Teachers will post what tier the lesson is at beside the posted standard.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

Administration will conduct frequent walk throughs using the Standards Walk Through tool to monitor our progress.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instruction will target areas of student deficiency using data to ensure that students show growth. According to administration observations, both formal and informal, it was observed that teachers struggled with using to data to design and provide lessons that meet student needs.

Measurable Outcome: During observations, both informal and formal, administration will see an increase in the percent of lessons delivered that use data to differentiate instruction. By doing this, the percentage of students who show growth on the ELA FSA should increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Bill Gilley (gillyb@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Chimney Lakes will continue to conduct Walk to Read Reading Mastery for students in grades K-2. In grades 3-5, Chimney Lakes will use LLI in small group instruction. Both programs will address student deficits by using initial placement and monitoring data to target instruction. Paraprofessionals, two reading interventionists, and a part-time Reading Tutor will assist with the implementation of these programs. Additionally, Chimney Lakes will train our media specialist to assist with supporting remediation of student comprehension skills. A Parent Liasion will be funded to help communicate with parents about how they can be supportive of our standards based educational approach.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Reading Mastery and LLI are both programs with a wide base of research that use testing and dat to place and monitor students so that individualized instruction can be delivered. Additionally, Reading Mastery and LLI are district approved and provided.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers, paraprofessionals, and interventionists in all grades on how to use the invervention programs.
2. Administration will monitor and train teachers on the implementation of programs.
3. Master-schedule will have Walk to Read embedded.
4. Teachers will receive TDE for training as needed throughout the year.
5. Paraprofessionals wil push into classrooms to work with students on deficient skills at each grade level.
6. Teachers will use a variety of methods including using technology such as computers and document cameras (replacement cameras will be provided to teachers who need them through Title One funding).
7. Parent Liaison will work with parents through schedulded parent nights with stratigies they can use to help support the work that is taking place in the classroom.

Person Responsible Bill Gilley (gilleyb@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will be using the data from the 5-essential surveys to work on Instructional Leadership area focusing on feedback. A feedback form will be developed for each type of walk through that occurs during the school year. Leadership will also develop a monthly focus calendar for the 2020-21 school year. Leadership will also add Acaletics for Science in the the fifth grade to continue improve proficiency in science. Chimney Lakes will also hire reading and math interventionist in order to support classroom learning and provide remeidation to students who fail to mastery the curriculum. A media specialist will be added to the staff in order to provide support for K-5 ELA teachers. Paraprofessioanls will also provide support for our most academically at-risk students in all subject areas. We will also be hiring an additional teacher (1st) to reduce class size and target at risk students. As we continue to foacus on standard based instruction, teachers will be provided supplies to supplement the work. The school plans on purchasing laptop computers to help interventionist remediate students in both math and reading.

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.

The school has added a parent liaison position to help with assisting the shcool with meeting he needs of all our parents. She will be responsible for parent nights based on those needs. The parent liaison will work along side of the PTA to promote parential involvement. School Advisory Council meetings will be held at two different times in order to give stakeholders a choice. We believe this will increase parent involvement.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00