
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	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Country Oaks Elementary School

2052 NW EUCALYPTUS BLVD, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=9&sc_id=1171294728

Demographics

Principal: Robin Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Hendry 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	0

Country Oaks Elementary School

2052 NW EUCALYPTUS BLVD, Labelle, FL 33935

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=9&sc_id=1171294728

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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.

Growing Successful Leaders

Provide the school's vision statement.

We provide a positive and engaging learning environment, where student leaders own their learning toward academic proficiency.

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
Jones, Robin	Principal	
Coker, Susan	School Counselor	
Garcia, Elvira	Instructional Coach	
Harris, Ryan	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Robin Jones

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

51

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	124	114	126	112	133	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	730
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	14	12	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	4	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	15	12	11	11	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	6	7	7	9	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	26	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	33	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	11	10	7	10	28	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 9/21/2020

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	126	119	117	135	129	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776
Attendance below 90 percent	28	18	20	21	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	9	15	15	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	42	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	6	2	5	23	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	126	119	117	135	129	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	776
Attendance below 90 percent	28	18	20	21	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	4	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	16	9	15	15	18	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	43	42	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	6	2	5	23	22	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	1	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	50%	50%	57%	45%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	58%	47%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	53%	45%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	56%	63%	52%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	62%	62%	61%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	45%	51%	45%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	44%	53%	52%	42%	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	53%	47%	6%	58%	-5%
	2018	41%	44%	-3%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
	2018	49%	47%	2%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	48%	47%	1%	56%	-8%
	2018	51%	45%	6%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	52%	-7%	62%	-17%
	2018	42%	48%	-6%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	57%	-4%	64%	-11%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	53%	53%	0%	60%	-7%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	41%	-8%	53%	-20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	43%	10%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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	27	40	33	33	51	38	14				
ELL	37	47	45	45	59	40	25				
BLK	43	33		43	54						
HSP	48	50	40	53	65	44	30				
WHT	57	56		54	59		65				
FRL	47	48	35	49	64	48	31				
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	27	42	35	34	50	41	33				
ELL	28	44	38	38	48	36	12				
BLK	20	43	33	23	52		30				
HSP	47	55	53	55	68	53	51				
WHT	62	60		68	63		67				
FRL	45	53	46	52	65	51	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	29	41	27	30	41	35	42				
ELL	33	36	38	44	56	45	28				
BLK	24	50	43	39	58	45	43				
HSP	43	46	47	51	62	44	46				
WHT	69	53		65	56		81				
FRL	42	46	43	47	58	45	46				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	46
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	43
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	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	58
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	48
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.

Science was our lowest performance indicator in 2019. Curriculum and assessments were not up to the rigor needed to show proficiency on NGSSS, and more data was needed to show detailed scoring of specific science standards.

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

Science showed the greatest decline and the lowest performance. New curriculum and unreliable assessments were not up to the rigor needed to show proficiency on NGSSS. Ongoing evaluation of standards is needed, along with reliable assessments to target specific content areas in 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.

Science showed the greatest gap from the state average of 53%, and our average was 36%. More reliable assessments are needed to show gaps when analyzing mastery of each science standard

and benchmark area. The Nature of Science was our lowest content area, with 6/10. The state average was 7/10.

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

Overall ELA Achievement showed the most improvement with 50% of the students meeting proficiency. Which was an increase of 2% over the previous year. ELA has been an on-going focus for grades K-5. Structured small groups were in place along with data monitoring throughout the year. Additional materials were used to target areas of weakness for student groups.

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

Students with two or more indicators increased from the previous year. While our attendance rate improved significantly, students that failed courses increased the most in 3rd and 4th grade. No state assessments were given to compare the consecutive years of state assessments.

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

1. Increase science proficiency in 5th grade by targeting content areas of weakness.
2. Identify students not meeting grade level expectations and assure interventions are in place and accurate for reading and math.
3. Identify our bottom quartile students for reading and math, and monitor progress through targeted assessments.
4. Monitor students that have failing grades in ELA / Math.
5. Attendance - Increase the frequency that parents are called regarding unexcused absences.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: COE had a drop of 17 points in science from the previous school year, from 53% proficient to 36% proficient. Our science scores should be more inline with our ELA scores, which was 50% proficient.

Measurable Outcome: Country Oaks will demonstrate a proficiency score of 53% on this year's state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will participate in standards based instruction that includes hands-on experiments for each content area of science, including assessments that will monitor growth and areas of need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Learners need hands-on experience, content rich reading material and opportunities to learn through doing to process science concepts that can be applied to complex scenarios. Accurate and focused assessments are also needed ensure mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. 4th/5th grade will attend science lab
2. Standards based assessments will be used to track growth and mastery.
3. We will implement Saturday science camp in the spring, prior to testing.
4. Vertical planning will be a part of planning.
5. Enrichment classes will include science instruction for one unit, focusing on our low scoring areas.
6. Writing will be incorporated across the curriculum to deepen science content vocabulary.

Person Responsible Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA proficiency remains below the state level. We did increase in ELA proficiency from 48% proficient to 50% on the last state assessment. Our ELA learning for bottom quartile and overall gains had a decrease. Learning gains decreased by 5%, and bottom quartile scores fell by 3%. Focusing on ELA overall proficiency for our for bottom quartile students, will increase ELA learning gains for all students through differentiated instruction.

Measurable Outcome: Country Oaks will increase ELA gains to 56%, and bottom quartile proficiency rate to 47%. This will be an increase of 6% points in ELA gains and 5% points for our bottom quartile students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will provide targeted instruction in small groups and monitor progress by use of iReady and standards mastery assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By targeting specific learning gaps and grouping students to increase proficiency in those areas, overall proficiency will increase. Students that have not mastered foundational reading skills need practice in order to move to more complex reading skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. iReady diagnostics are used to group students.
2. Small groups are formed to target gaps, using specific materials designed to address weak areas.
3. Admin and resource instructors will meet weekly to review progress and discuss instruction.
4. Student groups and instruction will be adjusted as necessary.
5. MTSS meetings will take place monthly, as an additional measure to monitor our bottom quartile students.
6. Writing instruction will be incorporated to strengthen vocabulary and help students to process reading content.
7. SIPPS is being implemented K-5 to target any reading gaps and strengthen foundational skills.

Person Responsible Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: COE had a 6% point drop in our math proficiency for our bottom quartile students on the last state assessments. this created an overall decrease in our math proficiency by 3% points. Our bottom quartile fell from 51% proficient to 48% proficient.

Measurable Outcome: Country Oaks plans to increase our percent proficient from 48% to 55% proficient in math for our bottom quartile students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will plan together and monitor gaps in math through iReady diagnostics and growth monitoring assessments. This targeted approach to math for our bottom quartile will work to strengthen students' abilities to access higher level math concepts, along with creating small groups for remediation and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: iReady identifies specific areas of weaknesses through their diagnostic assessments, and this can used to quickly target skills that need to be addressed. Working together to increase student engagement in math and create high quality lessons will motivate students to increase their skill level. students will demonstrate at least a year's growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze data to determine bottom quartile
2. Identify high impact areas of weakness
3. Collaborate on high engagement activities and implementations steps.
4. Group students for after-school program
5. monitor student growth monthly.

Person Responsible Robin Jones (jonesr@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. **Monitoring students that have course failures need to have a check-in system and check for interventions.**
2. **Attendance - while attendance has improved, it still needs to be monitored to make sure it isn't an indicator of failing course work.**
3. **SWD - student population will closely monitored by our resource teachers and classroom teachers to ensure they have the differentiated instruction needed to support academic growth. Our Federal index falls below the limit.**
4. **Bottom quartile students in ELA / Math will be charted by teachers and data will be looked at as a team.**

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.

Leader in Me is an ongoing initiative that promotes student leadership and school-wide staff involvement to develop the whole child. It holds students accountable for their own academic growth, social awareness, and personal leadership development. It also incorporates community stakeholders to become involvement in school-wide programs and service projects aimed at community improvement. Teachers will meet weekly to discuss student data, weekly instruction, and academic goals. School safety meetings will be held each month with our threat assessment team, which includes our SRO, to discuss improving safety and culture of our campus.

Teacher recruitment and professional development of new teachers will be based on need, but we will continue to maintain bi-weekly meetings with new teachers to make sure they have what they need to be successful. Conferences and programs will be presented at various times to accommodate parents work schedules and allow them the opportunity to have equal access to the school resources.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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