Polk County Public Schools

Winston Academy Of Engineering

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

http://schools.polk-fl.net/winston

Demographics

Principal: Lucus Wilkins

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2012

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)	80%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 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

Winston Academy Of Engineering

3415 SWINDELL RD, Lakeland, FL 33810

http://schools.polk-fl.net/winston

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	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	66%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to collaborate and use creative thinking to solve real-world problems, build and achieve dreams, embrace diverse cultures, and cultivate competitive engineers by preparing them for a diverse global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Winston Academy of Engineering will ensure the highest standards of intellectual development through a stimulating and comprehensive STEM program with an emphasis on Engineering. The learning community is actively involved to instill within students the courage to take appropriate risks, and have the confidence to accept challenges. Together we will give rise to students who are resilient and adaptable, equipped with knowledge and a 21st century skill set to achieve their greatest potential in an ever changing, diverse society.

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
Brown, Ava	Principal	Oversees the basic operations of the school including, but not limited, to finances, faculty, instruction, personnel, and safety.
McKenna, Timothy	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal in overseeing the basic operations of the school including, but not limited, to discipline, curriculum, testing, safety, facilities, and maintenance.
Cox, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Facilitates collaborative planning for ELA and Math, facilitates Professional Development, assists Administration and Teachers in maintaining and interpreting student data, and maintains the school's Title I documentation.
Stedem-Wyma, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Teaching gifted students in grades 4-5 and assists with collaborative planning for ELA as needed.
Accardo, Michelle	School Counselor	Assists teachers in implementing and maintaining MTSS procedures, communicate with parents whose students are in the MTSS process, and counsels students experiencing emotional distress.
Pope, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Teaches the STEM Lab for all classes in grades K-5, facilitate science collaborative planning with K-3 teachers, and assists the school's Leadership Team in planning the biannual Family STEM Nights.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2012, Lucus Wilkins

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

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)	80%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest

Regional Executive Director	
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	83	76	86	86	89	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	14	14	9	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	5	1	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Dec. 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	0	9	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Dec. 2019 STAR Math Level 1	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Thursday 5/21/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	

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	74%	51%	57%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	51%	58%	50%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	49%	53%	26%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	57%	63%	70%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	56%	62%	59%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	51%	45%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	47%	53%	51%	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	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	48%	29%	58%	19%
	2018	72%	48%	24%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
05	2019	73%	47%	26%	56%	17%
	2018	60%	50%	10%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	56%	27%	62%	21%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	56%	15%	64%	7%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	68%	51%	17%	60%	8%
	2018	75%	56%	19%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	59%	45%	14%	53%	6%
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	**ELA Ach.**	**ELA LG**	**ELA LG L25%**	**Math Ach.**	**Math LG**	**Math LG L25%**	**Sci Ach.**	**SS Ach.**	**MS Accel.**	**Grad Rate 2017-18**	**C & C Accel 2017-18**
SWD	20	47	55	35	67	58					
ELL	62	71		58	46	27	33				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	52	57	50	53	48	41	27				
HSP	75	71	60	73	59	33	67				
WHT	90	71		91	80		78				
FRL	59	63	52	64	61	45	42				

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	17	42		33	33						
ELL	52	72	67	64	52	55					
BLK	33	44	43	52	32	24	29				
HSP	66	73	67	76	64	56	56				
WHT	80	67		86	55		81				
FRL	53	61	53	65	49	34	45				

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	20			20							
ELL	47	32	17	53	48	42	25				
BLK	39	46	32	58	53	29	29				
HSP	58	40	13	65	58	50	50				
WHT	79	66		83	60		67				
FRL	47	36	19	62	47	32	44				

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	61
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	50
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	100
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	47
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	61
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	82
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	56
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Math Learning Gains for students in the bottom quartile. In addition, students with disabilities in ELA and Math underperformed the other subgroups and African American students underperformed in Math. Although these subgroups are still performed lower than others, when comparing 2018 to 2019, these subgroups did make gains. For example, students with disabilities improved from 17% to 20% in ELA and 33% to 35%. In Math, African Americans improved overall proficiency by 1% and their learning gains increased from 32% in 2018 to 41% in 2019.

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

The greatest decline occurred in the area of fifth grade mathematics which dropped by 7%. When considering subgroups, Hispanic students dropped in mathematics learning gains from 56% to 33%.

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.

Winston Academy out performed the state in all academic categories.

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

The area of greatest improvement occurred in overall proficiency for ELA in third grade. This grade level improved by 16% due to the fact that the students in this cohort have experienced Reading Workshop since Kindergarten. The same group of third graders also increased Math proficiency by 9%. In addition, Math learning gains for students with disabilities increased from 33% to 67%, ELA achievement for African Americans increased from 33% to 52%.

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

EWS data does not exhibit any areas of concern.

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

1. Students with Disabilities in ELA
2. Students with Disabilities in Math
3. African American Students in Math
4. Math Learning Gains for Bottom Quartile
5. Overall Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Subgroups has been selected as an area of focus because Students with disabilities are not performing at the same level of proficiency as other subgroups in both ELA and Math. Because Winston follows an inclusion model for ESE services, these students receive additional support within small groups provided by the ESE inclusion teacher, the ESE inclusion para, and/or the classroom teacher. The instruction taking place within these groups, according to the data, is not targeting the specific deficits these students have.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like students with disabilities to increase their proficiency in ELA from 20% to 25% during the 2020-2021 school year. In Math, we would like this subgroup to increase from 35% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from classroom formative, classroom summative, and progress monitoring assessments will be used to create small group interventions. Assessments will be analyzed according to specific items and skills in order to identify the areas of deficit that need to be addressed in small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data to drive instruction allows teachers to focus on the greatest areas of need and therefore close the achievement gap for these students at a faster rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop an accountability tool for ESE inclusion staff, teachers, and instructional paras who will be responsible for intervention groups.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

2. Train ESE inclusion teacher,intervention teachers, and instructional paras in using the accountability tool.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

3. Monitor the completion of the tool to ensure students are being provided with interventions on a regular basis.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

4. Host Curriculum Planning meetings to plan whole group lessons and interventions using supplemental resources and instructional supplies such as Florida Ready, Brain Pop, and USA Studies Weekly. All Curriculum Planning will be facilitated by the School-Based Reading Coach.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

5. Invite students with disabilities to participate in Extended Learning programs.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

6. Provide teachers with resources that meet the needs and interests of students such as library books, classroom libraries, and funding for field trips.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Winston did not perform as well as the state or the district in math learning gains for the bottom quartile. Our percentage of learning gains for the bottom quartile was 40% while the district was 47% and the state was 51%.
Measurable Outcome:	We would like to see Math Learning Gains for the Bottom Quartile reach 50% during the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from classroom formative,summative, and progress monitoring assessments will be used to create small group interventions. Assessments will be analyzed according to item and skill in order to determine the specific skills that are needed for small group remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using data to drive instruction allows teachers to focus on the greatest areas of need and therefore close the achievement gap for these students at a faster rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Develop an accountability tool for teachers and instructional paras who are responsible for intervention groups.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

2. Train intervention teachers and instructional paras in using the accountability tool.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

3. Monitor the completion of the tool to ensure students are being provided with interventions on a regular basis.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

4. Host Curriculum Planning meetings to plan whole group lessons and interventions using supplemental resources and instructional materials such as Florida Ready, Brain Pop, USA Studies Weekly, Reflex, and Nearpod.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

5. Invite students in the lowest quartile to participate in Extended Learning.

Person Responsible Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

6. Analyze and address the professional development needs of teachers in order to differentiate instruction for students and close the learning gap for students in the bottom quartile.

Person Responsible	Ava Brown (ava.brown@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An additional schoolwide improvement priority is Science proficiency. For two testing seasons, the school's science proficiency has remained at 59%. We would like to increase this proficiency to 65%. To do this we will implement an Article of the Week where students must read and apply scientific knowledge to real-world scenarios, implement Flashback Fridays where students are given an opportunity to review concepts from previously taught grade levels, and analyze data from classroom and quarterly assessments
in order to invite students to Extended Learning. Finally, we will purchase supplemental resources for science instruction, such as Edusmart, as needed.

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.

See PFEP plan.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**