

Polk County Public Schools

Highland City 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Highland City Elementary School

5355 9TH STREET SE, Highland City, FL 33846

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

Demographics

Principal: Amy Weingarth

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)	98%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

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	18

Highland City Elementary School

5355 9TH STREET SE, Highland City, FL 33846

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

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	79%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	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 Mission of Highland City Elementary is to provide a safe, nurturing learning environment where all stakeholders take responsibility for students reaching their highest potential. This will be accomplished through implementing focused professional development which ensures a highly qualified staff; providing the students with a high-quality instruction which will result in increased academic learning gains for all students; and ensuring that the school is part of the community and the community is part of the school. Parents, community, and the school staff will strive to work together to help the children grow educationally, physically, emotionally, and socially while strengthening the values of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision for Highland City Elementary is for each student to master the skills necessary to progress as lifelong learners who will become responsible citizens of our 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
Weingarth, Amy	Principal	
Horvatin, Jen	Teacher, K-12	
Pearce, Mary	Instructional Technology	
Van Hook, Sara	Assistant Principal	
Bowman, Mandy	Teacher, K-12	
Monahan, Jonna	Teacher, K-12	
Wengerd, Meghan	Teacher, K-12	
Glover, Emily	Teacher, K-12	
Groubert, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Aviles, Heidi	School Counselor	
Whatley, Erica	Teacher, K-12	
Stampe, Christina	Teacher, ESE	
Ally, Courtney		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Amy Weingarth

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

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)	98%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	73	74	67	74	82	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	9	8	12	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	
Dec. STAR 2019 Level 1s ELA	0	1	5	2	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Dec. STAR 2019 Level 1s Math	0	2	8	3	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	4	1	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	3	5	6	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 5/29/2020

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	76	59	70	82	78	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	421
Attendance below 90 percent	15	5	10	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	11	10	35	30	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	4	19	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	4	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	76	59	70	82	78	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	421
Attendance below 90 percent	15	5	10	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	9	11	10	35	30	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	17	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	2	4	19	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	4	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	51%	57%	60%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	51%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	49%	53%	43%	50%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	66%	57%	63%	51%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	56%	62%	47%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	47%	51%	32%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	47%	53%	55%	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	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	48%	6%	58%	-4%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	44%	47%	-3%	56%	-12%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	56%	13%	62%	7%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	56%	5%	64%	-3%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	57%	51%	6%	60%	-3%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	45%	17%	53%	9%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	31	40	46	33	56	60	20				
ELL	50	43		65	93						
BLK	32	46		52	67						
HSP	60	60		70	76						
WHT	59	57	65	66	62	60	68				
FRL	47	52	60	59	69	71	58				
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	23	28	22	27	31	22	16				
ELL	54			54							
BLK	43	65	55	37	35		27				
HSP	64	50		67	67						
WHT	59	51	35	63	59	28	61				
FRL	52	49	40	54	50	25	40				
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	3	12	19	6	19	25					
BLK	38	38		35	44						
HSP	69	61		54	43		62				
WHT	63	46	47	56	50	25	52				
FRL	47	30	32	44	39	29	43				

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	64
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	508
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	64
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	49
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	67
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	62
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	61
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 is ELA proficiency, specifically 5th grade ELA. The trend shows the student ELA performance data is declining each year. The contributing factors are the lack of consistent alignment of writing instruction school-wide and the need for earlier identification of foundational learning gaps.

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 is 5th grade ELA proficiency. The students with early foundational gaps continue to fall further behind in proficiency.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average is 5th grade ELA. The contributing factors are the lack of consistent alignment of writing instruction school-wide and the need for earlier identification of foundational learning gaps.

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

The data component that showed the most improved is the lowest 25% math gains. The actions our school took to ensure we targeted math learning gains include: analyzing student data, vertical team alignment, and strategic use of resource personnel.

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

Two potential areas of concern are the students with below 90 percent attendance and the number of students with Ds and Fs in K-2 vs 3-5.

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

1. Closing the gap between ELA proficiency in 3rd through 5th
2. Increase the proficiency of ELA in 3rd through 5th
3. Maintain learning gains in ELA and math
4. Maintain learning gains of the lowest 25% in ELA and math
5. Decrease the number of students with less than 90 percent attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Area of Focus is to improve core ELA instruction which will increase student proficiency. We saw the need for improving core instruction because of a three-year declining data-trend in 16-17 (60%), 17-18 (58%), 18-19 (57%).

Measurable Outcome: Increase FSA ELA proficiency by 5% in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Weingarth (amy.weingarth@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -Continue the implementation of the LSI framework
-Continue the implementation of the Riggs phonograms
-Continue the implementation of Accelerated Reader

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies have proven to be effective in increasing student proficiency. LSI professional development opportunities were provided through the district for administration and teachers. Accelerated Reader is an evidence-based program that is provided by the district. The teachers utilize the tools for teaching and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

During the school year, the instructional coach and the LSI team members will provide professional development during PLCs and staff development days. The content of the PD sessions will be student success criteria, implementation of teaming techniques, and student engagement. The LSI team members will share best practices in relation to student engagement, small group instruction, and success criteria.

Person Responsible: Amy Weingarth (amy.weingarth@polk-fl.net)

Teachers will provide technology and resources, such as Weekly Readers as some of the tools students can use to produce tasks and engage their thinking to enhance engagement.

Person Responsible: Amy Weingarth (amy.weingarth@polk-fl.net)

Administration and the instructional coach will collaborate with teachers through vertical teams, planning days, and grade level/content area teams so that teachers can discuss the implementation of the evidence-based strategies and the Florida standards.

Person Responsible: Amy Weingarth (amy.weingarth@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our second Area of Focus is to improve small group instruction in both ELA and math. By breaking students into smaller groups based on their needs, teachers can target skill deficiencies, track learning and adjust based on the group's needs. This should result in better learning gains for all. Data shows the strategies put in place last year were successful in increasing learning gains in ELA and math. ELA learning gains: 16-17 (43), 17-18 (41), 18-19 (56) Math learning gains: 16-17 (32), 17-18 (29), 18-19 (66)

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase our learning gains in ELA and math by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Weingarth (amy.weingarth@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing the LSI strategies, specifically student success criteria, to meet the needs of each student.
Utilizing a multi-sensory approach to instruction in both whole and small groups.
Regularly integrate fact fluency into daily routine.
Teach students math utilizing a developmental progression.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategies utilized in the previous school year were successful in increasing the learning gains, and continuing the use of these strategies should yield an upward trend.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators and the Title I instructional coach will meet with teachers weekly to discuss ongoing ELA and math assessment data. Based on these discussions, teachers will create small group plans for students who are not mastering the standards. In addition, ESE resource teachers will attend vertical team planning sessions and co-teach the ELA and math standards with general education teachers.

Person Responsible: Sara Van Hook (sara.vanhook@polk-fl.net)

The Title I paraeducators will work with small groups of students within classrooms to review skills and provide scaffolding, as needed, based on ongoing student learning data.

Person Responsible: Amy Weingarth (amy.weingarth@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will utilize the MTSS process to create tier 2 and tier 3 plans to increase attendance for students that have below 90 percent attendance rate as well as students who have a failing grade in a core subject.

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.

A positive culture is built into every day for our students through the use of CHAMPS and PBIS. Daily, students have opportunities to earn gold tickets which are drawn weekly for free books. Teachers utilize the PBIS points system so students can work towards earning a monthly incentive based on meeting our school-wide expectations. In addition, staff members are always on the lookout for students deserving positive referrals, reflecting extraordinarily good choices. The Sanford Harmony program is also taught in each class, to increase positive interactions between all of our students.

As part of our efforts to build positive connections with parents, teachers, and community members, we utilize weekly communication folders, student and parent newsletters, agendas, and digital communication platforms which helps our stakeholders to remain connected. Through our Title I program, we are able to fund several parent and family engagement events, where we focus on educating stakeholders on ways to support their child's education from home.

Volunteers are a vital part of Highland City Elementary. As part of our efforts to build positive connections with volunteers, a volunteer orientation is scheduled at the beginning of each school year. Collaborating with our volunteers enables us to share school improvement strategies. Our volunteers help support our positive school culture through their dedication and commitment to our students. In addition to our general volunteers, we partner with the United Way which provides Reading Pals to us. Our Reading Pals consistently visit our school on a weekly basis to work with our kindergarten students on building literacy. We partner with Revive Church and TBA Church to provide essential items for students and teachers, to collaborate on events held at HCE, and to coordinate assisting in the classroom with students. TBA extends their partnership into supporting the academic and social growth of our students. Twice a week, TBA provides afternoon tutoring and homework help for a large group of our students. Our teachers and the administrative team keep in close contact with the volunteers of TBA's Homework Hub to ensure they know which resources are available to the students and how they can offer the best support.

Our School Advisory Council is an essential part of the success of Highland City Elementary. Our SAC is composed of Highland City Elementary staff, parents, and community partners. Our SAC meets a minimum of four times a year to make school improvement decisions, discuss the ongoing data, organize events and school communications, and review Title I procedures.

Highland City Elementary teachers open their classrooms to future teachers to observe and implement best instructional practices. The area universities and colleges work with our administration to place their students in teacher's classrooms that have the credentials needed to supervise an intern. During their internships, the college students are directly involved in planning, providing instruction, and reviewing student data and learning how to alter instruction based on student's individual needs. Teachers ensure to provide interns with classroom management and culture training as part of their internship experience.

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: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00