

Taylor County School District

Taylor County 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Taylor County Elementary School

1600 E GREEN ST, Perry, FL 32347

http://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_es

Demographics

Principal: Chuck Finley

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2020

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)	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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Taylor 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

Taylor County Elementary School

1600 E GREEN ST, Perry, FL 32347

http://www.edline.net/pages/taylor_county_es

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	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	38%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Taylor 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.

Taylor County Elementary School is committed to providing all students with a safe, positive and challenging learning environment that enables all learners to become well-prepared, productive and contributing citizens in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Taylor County Elementary School will assist all students with the recognition and development of individuality, self-growth and responsibility while using a variety of strategies and cooperative efforts throughout the school, home and community.

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
Roberts, Angie	School Counselor	
Lavalle, Cherie	Instructional Coach	
Bethea, Courtney	Principal	
Poppell, Rachel	Assistant Principal	
White, Deana	Instructional Coach	
MacNeill, Sally	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 8/1/2020, Chuck Finley

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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)	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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	0	2	3	197	224	195	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	621
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	69	44	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	53	38	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	41	41	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
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	

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	0	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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 9/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	25	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	15	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	51	18	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	0	10	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	25	6	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	5	15	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	51	18	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66

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	0	10	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	6	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	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	54%	73%	57%	49%	47%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	75%	58%	47%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	56%	53%	47%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	78%	63%	57%	47%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	78%	62%	44%	49%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	56%	51%	34%	34%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	53%	53%	50%	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	58%	59%	-1%	58%	0%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	58%	-1%	58%	-1%
	2018	48%	47%	1%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	44%	46%	-2%	56%	-12%
	2018	44%	43%	1%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	71%	-1%	62%	8%
	2018	68%	68%	0%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	67%	0%	64%	3%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	60%	-1%
	2018	42%	41%	1%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	53%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	39	49	57	52	62	61	41				
BLK	43	55	56	56	59	54	33				
HSP	50	46		61	62		50				
MUL	55	62		63	86		50				
WHT	58	58	58	69	62	55	59				
FRL	51	55	53	63	60	55	51				
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	28	26	22	47	33	11	35				
BLK	33	46	50	43	38	33	29				
HSP	60	40		64	45		75				
MUL	41	37		51	41	30	50				
WHT	55	51	36	60	44	30	61				
FRL	42	46	41	47	38	29	44				
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	23	43	44	47	42	29	26				
ASN	60			70							
BLK	30	34	33	36	27	31	21				
HSP	58	53		59	53						
MUL	50	35		56	42						
WHT	55	52	55	64	50	38	61				
FRL	43	43	42	50	39	34	37				

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	58

ESSA Federal Index	
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	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	
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	54
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	63
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	60
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.

As compared to state averages, the data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA achievement. The contributing factor to low achievement in this area is a result of low performance in 5th grade based on prior years gaps and a lack of standards based collaboration across the grade level. This cohort has a trend of being well below the state proficiency percentage, with a one percent increase in the gap compared to the state average from the prior year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was achievement levels in both math and ELA for our Hispanic students. The explanation for the great decline in this area is the limited number of students we have in this subgroup. Due to low percentages of Hispanic students one or two students scores can greatly effect the proficiency percentage.

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.

ELA achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. TCES was at 54% and the state average was 57%. The greatest contributing factor was our 5th grade ELA achievement which showed a -12% deficit as compared to the state average (TCES 44% and State 56%). All other grades met the state average, leaving 5th grade as the factor that caused TCES to miss the state mark in ELA. The trend for this cohort of students is digressing year over year.

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

Math achievement showed the most improvement, specifically within the lowest quartile students. TCES began working with K12 Lift for data disaggregation and data based decision making. TCES also participated in the Florida Standards Academy to improve standards based instruction. The primary area of focus was 4th grade math. 4th grade math began implementing common planning time weekly where collaborative planning and standards based instruction was a focus. We also continued using the ASEND math remedial program as an instructional pullout method for students in the lowest quartile.

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

Attendance

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

1. 5th Grade ELA Achievement
2. ELA Achievement for minority students
3. ELA Achievement for SWD
4. 5th Grade Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Increase the percentage of student showing proficiency in ELA on the 5th Grade Florida Standards Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

Students showing proficiency in ELA on the 5th Grade Florida Standards Assessment will increase from 44% to 60%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cherie Lavalley (cherie.lavalley@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Students who fall in the lowest quartile for ELA will attend Bright Fish Remedial Reading classes daily during wheel. This will be funded through a Title 1 Remediation Teacher.
2. All classroom teachers will use research based programs and interventions for differentiated instruction (ie. iReady, STAR,) based on disaggregated data provided by K12 Lift.
3. All grade level teachers, virtual teachers, the ESE support teacher, and the remedial ELA teacher will participate in collaborative planning to ensure all targeted standards and skills are being addressed and met from a team standpoint.
4. Teachers will analyze and disaggregate data after each iReady diagnostic (three times per year) with instructional coaches, grade level team leaders, and administration. K12 Lift will provide support and portfolio data for this process.
5. Instructional coach and administration will visit classrooms and provide feedback concerning student engagement, level of rigor, and standards based instructional practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. The implementation of Bright Fish Reading into student's daily schedules will help close learning gaps that exist, while allowing the students ELA teacher to continue with current grade level standards based instruction.
2. The use of iReady allows teachers to incorporate a customizable learning path, which is standards based and assist in closing gaps in student proficiency. Having student work on individualized paths assist in closing gaps while not hindering those who have already mastered skills.
- 3-5. Collaboration is a vital component in the professional development of teachers. Working with peers, coaches, and administration to make data based decisions which promote standards based instruction will improve achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Remedial instruction will be completed daily for students who are below proficiency levels in ELA. The Title 1 Remedial teacher will provide daily small group and individual instruction on remedial skills using the Bright Fish Intervention Curriculum. Classroom teachers will complete small group and individualized instruction for Tier 1 and Tier 2 students weekly.
2. Individualized student instruction paths will be used for all students. Individualized iReady lessons will be completed 45 minutes a week and can be done over multiple days.
- 3-5. Teacher will collaborate weekly with grade level content area peers and instructional coach.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student attendance is a vital component in maintaining student achievement. In order for students to show adequate yearly progress and achieve content area proficiency they must be present at school to receive instruction. Students with attendance concerns often create learning gaps which are difficult to close. As student continue in the cycle of poor attendance the gaps become greater each year.

Measurable Outcome: Ninety percent of TCES students will maintain a ninety percent attendance rating throughout the school year. This will be tracked weekly on a school average basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rachel Poppell (rachel.poppell@taylor.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Attendance will be tracked weekly. Classrooms with perfect attendance will be announced daily and incentives will be given to classrooms who have the highest number of days with perfect attendance for the month.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Incentives encourage positive behaviors. Creating a culture which celebrates attendance will encourage students to be present and involved in the learning process. Positive affirmations and rewards will be used to encourage and incentivize students to be present at school. Student attendance will directly affect student achievement and proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor classroom perfect attendance daily and announce daily during the morning announcements.
2. Monitor school wide attendance percentages weekly.
3. Provide classroom incentives/rewards for classrooms with highest perfect attendance percentages.
4. Identification of student concerns by teacher to administration and parent liaison. Administration will conduct parent conferences, home visits, and other forms of communication to reach out to families concerning poor attendance.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Improving attendance rates, especially those of student with high rates of absences, remains a top priority for TCSD and specifically for our school (TCES). To date, during the 2020-2021 school year we are already seeing a trend for high numbers of absences as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. During the first weeks of school we have had an abnormally high number of students who have yet to attend school or who are doing minimal on our TEC (virtual) platform. The school leadership team has teachers print weekly list of student concerns, in regard to attendance and participation via TEC and Brick and Mortar. We are making phone calls, home visits, and exhausting the resources of our school SRD, social worker, and parent liaison in an attempt to make contact with students who are no shows or who are participating at minimal or no effort. We will continue this process until all students have been reached. Teachers will also continue using classroom incentives as well as school wide incentives to encourage good attendance. We realize this year is challenging concerning attendance due to the pandemic, therefore we will also utilize our Canvas virtual learning platform to easily adjust students to online learning when the can not be physically present at school.

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 Covid-19 pandemic has created an environment which makes it difficult to have outside visitors on campus this school year. This poses a challenge to including stakeholders in the decision making process. The district policy prohibits visitors on campus while students are present. However, at TCES we will continue the partnership we have with families, the community, and all stakeholders in more creative methods.

This year we held our annual "Meet the Teacher" back to school event by scheduling individual and small group orientation appointments for parents and students.

TCES will continue with our monthly School Advisory Committee meetings, which includes parents, teachers, administrators, community leaders, and business members.

TCES Parent and Teacher Organization will continue working together to create fund raising opportunities, provide Positive Behavior School incentives, and reward student academic achievement..

TCES hosted it annual Open House within the first month of school. Each grade level did did individual small group parent meetings to discuss student diagnostic data, procedures for their grade level, curriculum, and Title 1.

Parent Conferences will be held once every nine week and will be scheduled during a variety of times which meets the needs of all families. Evening appointments will be made for working families.

TCES hosted a TEC Family Night, for students who opted for virtual instruction. This even provide

information on our virtual learning platform Canvas, using FOCUS for attendance and to view grades, Microsoft 365, and technical assistance. Teachers, site-based administrators, district level administrators, and MIS staff were on hand to assist parents and students.

TCES will continue its partnership with the Panhandle Area Education Consortium and the Read With Me grant which provides family events and free books for all students.

Parents can view student grades on our online FOCUS portal.

TCES will continue using Social Media and Class DOJO to communicate and disseminate information to parents and the community. Class DOJO is also used as a behavior management platform which allows parents to easily access student behavior data and communicate with faculty and staff in regards to their students behavior.

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: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00