

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Alfred Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/lae>

Demographics

Principal: Matt Burkett

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2012

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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 Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

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

Lake Alfred Elementary School

550 CUMMINGS ST E, Lake Alfred, FL 33850

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/lae>

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	94%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

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 Polk 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 staff at Lake Alfred Elementary believes that all students will reach their full potential and achieve excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

Lake Alfred Elementary will provide highly effective instruction using best practices to increase student achievement.

Motto: "Learners Achieving Excellence" (LAE)

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
Burkett, Matt	Principal	The school's instructional leader and facilitator, as well as all other aspects of the school.
Wilson, Faye	Assistant Principal	A member of the school's instructional leadership team and facilitator, as well as all other aspects of the school.
Crowley, Jennifer	Dean	A member of the school's leadership team and facilitator, especially in the areas of Discipline and ESOL,
Valdes, Michelle	Instructional Coach	A member of the school's instructional leadership team and facilitator, especially in the area of ELA
Smith, Elizabeth	School Counselor	A member of the school's instructional leadership team and facilitator, with a concentration on student services, ESE, and MTSS.
Hadsock, Jennifer	Other	A member of the school's instructional leadership team and facilitator, especially in the area of ELA as the Reading Interventionist.
Snapko, Rachel	Instructional Coach	A member of the school's instructional leadership team and facilitator, especially in the area of math.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2012, Matt Burkett

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	100	107	117	136	120	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	703
Attendance below 90 percent	24	20	14	27	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	4	18	30	25	37	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
Course failure in ELA	3	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	17	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Dec. STAR 2019 ELA Level 1	0	0	0	28	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Dec. STAR 2019 Math Level 1	0	0	0	17	11	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	5	6	11	26	24	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 5/20/2020

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	100	106	102	139	112	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	25	21	15	18	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	1	2	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	4	22	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	100	106	102	139	112	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	683
Attendance below 90 percent	25	21	15	18	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	0	1	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators		0	1	2	5	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	4	22	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	46%	51%	57%	45%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	49%	53%	42%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	60%	57%	63%	51%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	47%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	51%	38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	47%	53%	38%	46%	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	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	48%	1%	58%	-9%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	42%	47%	-5%	56%	-14%
	2018	56%	50%	6%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	56%	0%	64%	-8%
	2018	69%	57%	12%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	59%	51%	8%	60%	-1%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	50%	45%	5%	53%	-3%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	18	25	18	29	31						
ELL	36	45	22	56	69	65	26				
BLK	37	42	50	54	62	58	50				
HSP	43	46	28	58	66	60	35				
WHT	61	69	62	69	63		71				
FRL	39	50	50	53	60	55	44				
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	38	22	21	39	48	46					
ELL	52	57	44	55	48	43	61				
BLK	38	45	41	41	45	26	52				
HSP	65	62	47	63	38	40	71				
WHT	62	54	70	70	62	50	69				
FRL	52	54	56	54	45	34	63				

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	10	34	32	19	34	29	10				
ELL	27	36	26	44	50	37	17				
BLK	34	44	36	44	44	36	23				
HSP	44	47	43	50	51	33	37				
WHT	58	43		59	43	50	59				
FRL	38	44	44	46	46	39	22				

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	56
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	53
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	66
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	52
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.

ELA Achievement and ELA Learning Gains each showed 46%. Our SWD, ELL, and Black population are having a difficult time acquiring the grade level skills and retaining them over an extended period of time.

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

ELA Achievement went from 55% to 46%. A lack of consistent small group instruction for meeting the students instructional needs played a pivotal role in this decrease.

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 was 46% and the State's ELA was 57%. A lack of consistent small group instruction for meeting the students instructional needs played a pivotal role in this decrease.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the greatest improvement. It went from 58% to 64%. The Math Coach planned with teachers to implement grade level tasks to be completed in small groups. The bottom 25% were closely monitored and instruction was adjusted as needed.

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

12% of 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders were below 90% in attendance. 11% of the 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders scored level 1 on the State Assessment.

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

1. Reading Proficiency (especially SWD)
2. Math Small group instruction
3. Discipline (lower referral numbers)
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus	Our reading and math data indicates a need to be consistent in small group instruction.
Description and Rationale:	Implementing small group instruction, provides an opportunity to accommodate and meet the needs of each student. Reading and math are the basic foundations of learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Our plan is to move all students. However, we will put more emphasis on our bottom 25% population. In the 18-19 school year, our data showed our bottom 25% for ELA was 46% and math was 58%. By implementing these strategies consistently, we will increase our ELA to 51% and Math to 63%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will review our data and use the three-tier model of intervention to create small guided reading and math groups. This evidence-based direct instruction explicitly target skills such as phonological/phonemic awareness, letter-sound recognition, alphabetic decoding, fluency building and comprehension skills for reading. For math we will be able to drill down these areas for struggling students: Operations, Algebraic Thinking, Fractions, and Measurement. Groups will consist of 3 to 6 students. By implementing this strategy the results will show higher gains for this subgroup of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on the lasted STAR data and the 2018-19 FSA data, we need to be consistent with working with our bottom 25%. We will be using a variety of material in reading for small guided reading groups such as: A-Z leveled readers, Scholastic leveled readers, and Fountas and Pinnell leveled readers. For math, we will also utilized a variety of resources such as leveled skilled sheets, task cards, manipulatives, and constructed response tasks.

Action Steps to Implement

During collaborative planning of both ELA and Math, teachers will utilized data to create small groups. Students will be grouped based on their individual needs. In ELA, leveled readers will be utilized. In Math, leveled grade level tasks will be utilized. Classroom libraries that consists of a variety of genres, are available to students to read during small group time. The Title 1 Paras (Horne, Sierra, and Williams), the Title 1 Reading Interventionist (Haddock), the Reading Coach (Valdes), and the Math Coach (Snapko) will assist in facilitating instruction for this group of students. We will also offer after-school tutoring, as well as Saturday Camp for this group of students. During tutoring, we will use a variety of resources including instructional technology (iPads, laptops, etc.). Students will participate in a book study on small math group instruction and guided reading to assist with implementing this consistently. General supplies, such as paper, ink/toner are purchased to help implement these strategies.

Person Responsible Faye Wilson (faye.wilson@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The data indicates 27% of our students are SWD. This subgroup is below the threshold of 41%. Our SWD population is at 32%. Students with learning disabilities experience an imbalance in their own ability levels. They are very good at some things, but struggle at other things. they feel the tension between what they can and cannot do, which causes frustration and decreases the learning outcome.

Measurable Outcome: When this subgroup of students is learning new skills, the instructional staff will provide scaffolds and support to assist their learning. They will gradually withdraw the supports as the student become more competent. The provision of scaffolds and support will assist the student to achieve their learning goals and reduces anxiety. By providing these strategies, this population will go above the 41% threshold.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Faye Wilson (faye.wilson@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Once research based strategy we will implement in all classrooms with be "Control of task difficulty". Instruction will be at the student's instructional level. It will be sequenced from simple to complex. The work load will be adjusted to maintain a high level of success. The student will have daily one-on-one or small group instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This strategy will assist students in understanding and learning new material or skills, integrate this new information with what we already know in a way that makes sense, and recall the information or skill later, even in a different situation such as State Testing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The MTSS team will introduce and work with classroom teachers on implementing the strategy
2. The Reading and Math Coaches, along with administration will monitor it's implementation.
3. Book study on effective classroom management to help meet the needs of all learners.

Person Responsible Matt Burkett (matt.burkett@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

This year, we have a Dean, who will work closely with administration to decrease office referrals. We will work with struggling teachers on classroom management through a book study, as well as, individual assistance. Decreasing office referrals, will provide an opportunity to increase learning outcome for all students.

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.

Motivation, success, and feeling valued are what drives school staff to be successful. It is critically important that we celebrate and recognize the outstanding things that our school community accomplishes, both inside and out of our buildings. Here are some ways the leadership team will build a positive school culture and environment: 1. Invest in our staff and students by building relationships. 2. Collaboratively build and implement a shared vision. 3. Be role models. 4. Praise and celebrations.

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: Small Group Instruction					\$10,814.77
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
	5100	100-Salaries	0651 - Lake Alfred Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$10,814.77	
			Notes: Since we are focusing on small guided groups in reading and math, we will provide time for additional collaborative planning for teachers guided by the math and reading coaches.				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities					\$0.00
Total:							\$10,814.77