Cracker Trail Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cracker Trail Elementary School

8200 SPARTA RD, Sebring, FL 33875

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~cte/

Demographics

Principal: Richard Kogelschatz

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2020

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* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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 was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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

Cracker Trail Elementary School

8200 SPARTA RD, Sebring, FL 33875

http://www.highlands.k12.fl.us/~cte/

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	88%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Highlands County School Board on 10/6/2020.

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.

"To Develop Lifelong Learners and Leaders"

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Leading Together To Achieve Excellence"

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
Kogelschatz, Rick	Principal	
Belanger, Ian	Instructional Technology	
Prendergast, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	
White, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Pugh-Clogston, Stacey	Teacher, K-12	
Eures, Katherine	Instructional Coach	
Brooks, Cara	Teacher, K-12	
Brooker, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Thomas, Travis	Teacher, K-12	
Schult, Krista	Teacher, K-12	
Piller, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	
Hines, Denise	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/17/2020, Richard Kogelschatz

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.*
3

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
38

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* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (54%)
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	6	118	107	129	88	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	8	10	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	1	7	1	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	1	28	0	11	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	19	0	8	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	8	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	1	7	1	4	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 5/22/2020

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	4	111	105	122	88	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	2	15	13	21	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	2	17	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	21	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	1	4	0	5	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	4	111	105	122	88	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	2	15	13	21	10	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	2	17	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	21	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100

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	1	4	0	5	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	53%	50%	57%	58%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	54%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	49%	53%	41%	47%	52%
Math Achievement	56%	57%	63%	64%	59%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	57%	62%	63%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	44%	51%	44%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	45%	53%	53%	47%	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	63%	50%	13%	58%	5%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	49%	-5%	58%	-14%
	2018	49%	45%	4%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	46%	45%	1%	56%	-10%
	2018	54%	47%	7%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	56%	1%	62%	-5%
	2018	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	60%	-5%	64%	-9%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	51%	49%	2%	60%	-9%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	43%	12%	53%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	50%	9%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	21	19	22	27	37	32	17				
ELL	15	27		23	50						
BLK	69	79		40	64		54				
HSP	44	43	41	51	57	26	49				
MUL	27	27		40	55						
WHT	55	53	38	60	61	34	64				
FRL	38	44	42	42	50	34	41				
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	4	12	13	17	20	19	14				
ELL	9			27							
BLK	43	50		29	22						
HSP	41	30	35	56	46	38	54				
MUL	38	40		50	40						
WHT	57	44	30	68	53	33	67				
FRL	44	38	28	54	49	33	49				
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	22	53	43	30	41	29	27				
ELL	25	40		50	50						
BLK	32	35	33	48	41						
HSP	53	57	44	64	60	50	44				
MUL	25	70		44	50						
WHT	65	62	38	66	66	49	58				
FRL	48	55	44	56	54	39	52				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	61
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	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	52
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	42
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.

Analysis from 2018-2019 data. No state FSA testing in 2019-2020 due to COVID-19 school closure.
Math Lowest 25th Percentile 34%
Trend: The trend over the last 3 years has been 44%, 30%, 34%.
Contributing factors: Historically, the students in lowest 25th percentile have struggled to make learning gains, ELA correlation - these students also struggle in ELA (reading the math content and problems), teacher experience, curriculum - built to fit standards - not an ideal flow of instruction from adopted curriculum.

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

Analysis from 2018-2019 data. No state FSA testing in 2019-2020 due to COVID-19 school closure.
Math Achievement 63% (17-18) to 56% (18-19). This was a 7% decrease from the previous year.

Factors that contributed to this decline: 5th grade group from 17-18 high group (71% proficiency), teacher experience, CKLA focus takes time from math planning and instruction.

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.

Analysis from 2018-2019 data. No state FSA testing in 2019-2020 due to COVID-19 school closure.
The Math Lowest 25th Percentile had the biggest gap when compared to the state average.
Math Lowest 25th - 34% (State 51%) Gap = 17%
*There was a 4% increase in the school percentage from 2017/2018 (30%) to 2018/2019 (34%)
*There was also a 4% increase in the state average from 2017/2018 (47%) to 2018/2019 (51%)
Trend: 2017 - 44% (State 51%) Gap = 7%, 2018 - 30% (State 47%) Gap = 17%
Contributing factors: Historically, the students in lowest 25th percentile have struggled to make learning gains, ELA correlation - these students also struggle in ELA (reading the math content and problems), teacher experience, curriculum - built to fit standards - not an ideal flow of instruction from adopted curriculum.

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

Analysis from 2018-2019 data. No state FSA testing in 2019-2020 due to COVID-19 school closure.
English Language Arts for 3rd Grade showed the most improvement for the 2018-2019 school year. The percent proficient increased by 9% from 54% to 63%.
New actions taken in this area...smaller class size due to an extra teaching unit paid for by the school, experienced team of teachers understanding what they were teaching, common planning, great collaboration.

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

Analysis from 2018-2019 data. No state FSA testing in 2019-2020 due to COVID-19 school closure.
Level 1 on Statewide Assessment - ELA and Math
3rd grade - 14
4th grade - 21
5th grade - 65

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

Analysis from 2018-2019 data. No state FSA testing in 2019-2020 due to COVID-19 school closure.
ELA Learning Gains
Math Learning Gains
Math Lowest 25th Learning Gains

Subgroup Priorities
1. ELL - ELA 15%
2. SWD - Science 17%
3. SWD - ELA LG 19%
4. SWD - ELA 21%
5. SWD - ELA LG Lowest 25 22%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Learning Gains for the school was 51% compared to the District 54% and State 58%. Learning Gains would target students in 5th grade. Subgroup Rationale SWD 19% ELL 27% Multiracial 27%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains by 4% from 51% to 55% in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katherine Eures (eureska@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use standards aligned curriculum Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School Board of Highlands County Strategic Plan

Action Steps to Implement

1. ELA Professional Learning Communities
2. Learning Gains PD
3. ELA Curriculum - Core and Supplemental
4. ELA Professional Development
5. MTSS Interventions and Monitoring
6. Progress Monitoring
7. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool
8. Instructional Coach Support

Person Responsible	Katherine Eures (eureska@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Learning Gains for the school was 60% compared to the District 57% and State 62%. Learning Gains would target all students 5th grade. Subgroup Rationale SWD 37%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains by 4% from 60% to 64% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use standards aligned curriculum Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School Board of Highlands County Strategic Plan

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math Professional Learning Communities
2. Learning Gains PD
3. District Developed Instructional Plans
4. Focused skill instruction
5. Progress Monitoring
6. Effective Instruction Tools - IPG Planning Tool

Person Responsible	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Learning Gains for the lowest quartile was 34% compared to the District 44% and State 51%. Largest gap compared to the state - 17% Subgroup Rationale SWD 32% HSP 26% WHT 34% FRL 34%
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-2021, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase learning gains for the lowest quartile by 4% from 34% to 38% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use standards aligned curriculum Models of Effective Instruction Implement a collaborative planning framework - Professional Learning Communities
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School Board of Highlands County Strategic Plan

Action Steps to Implement

1. Math Professional Learning Communities
2. Learning Gains PD
3. Identification and communication of L25 students
4. Focused skill instruction
5. Progress Monitoring

Person Responsible	Rick Kogelschatz (kogelscr@highlands.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Science
In 2020-2021, Cracker Trail Elementary will increase proficiency on the Statewide Science Assessment by 4% from 57% to 61%.

iReady
All students will make at least one year's worth of growth on i-Ready ELA.
All students will make at least one year's worth of growth on i-Ready Math.

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.

To increase parent involvement and build positive relationships with families, as well as increase communication to inform parents of their child's progress, we host:
• Open house and Orientation night
• Report Card Conferences with Parents
• PTO Family Nights - Hoe Down
• Science Fair/ Art Showcase
• Fall Character Parade
• Fall and Winter Meal
• Dads Take Your Child to School Day
*Events may be changed or canceled based on guidelines set in response to COVID-19.

In addition we communicate with families and the community through:
• School & Classroom Websites
• School Facebook Page
• Monthly School Newsletters
• Weekly Classroom Newsletters
• Call-Outs to Families (to communicate important information/reminders)
• iOS & Android APP (push messages)
• Student planners/Communication folders
• Leadership notebooks
• DoJo App
• Remind App
• PTO Meetings
• SAC Meetings
• Title I Annual Meeting
• Business Partnerships

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: Math**	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**