

Polk County Public Schools

Lake Shipp 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathy Raub

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2018

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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lake Shipp Elementary School

250 CAMELLIA DR, Winter Haven, FL 33880

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

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

At Lake Shipp Elementary, we will foster a learning environment that helps students understand the purpose of learning while actively engaged in student centered activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:

At Lake Shipp Elementary students are educated through a collaborative team consisting of parents, school staff, peers, and the community to become lifelong learners. Children take risks and become productive and innovative without fear of failure; their gifts and talents are recognized and celebrated.

MOTTO:

Be Responsible
Be Respectful
Be Safe

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
Raub, Kathryn	Principal	
Irace, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Murphy, Jane	Instructional Coach	
Gossman, Sara	Instructional Media	
Spencer, Sharonda	Instructional Coach	
Moriarty, Alyssa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 6/10/2018, Kathy Raub

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.*

2

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

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: C (53%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	89	95	92	90	73	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	513
Attendance below 90 percent	20	20	10	23	6	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	5	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	5	6	9	13	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	2	2	2	7	18	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	6	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
December 2019 STAR Reading Level 1	0	0	2	22	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
DEcember 2019 STAR Math Levvel 1	0	3	22	6	9	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	8	7	8	22	14	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/8/2020

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	78	89	82	92	70	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	485
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	8	4	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	34	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	2	3	13	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	0	23	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	78	89	82	92	70	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	485
Attendance below 90 percent	6	5	8	4	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	34	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	2	3	13	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	0	23	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	49%	51%	57%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	51%	58%	56%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	53%	57%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	57%	63%	45%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	39%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	47%	51%	33%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	47%	53%	53%	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	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	47%	47%	0%	56%	-9%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	56%	2%	62%	-4%
	2018	48%	56%	-8%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	56%	-9%	64%	-17%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	48%	51%	-3%	60%	-12%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	45%	-5%	53%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	55%	-5%
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	26	47	45	26	67	70					
ELL	26	36		47	46						
BLK	44	57	40	42	65	75	40				
HSP	39	41	45	55	58		41				
MUL	40			40							
WHT	62	54		62	49		45				
FRL	49	51	50	50	56	65	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	9	26		9	32	33					
ELL	28	70	81	38	61	70					
BLK	31	40	45	41	47	38	45				
HSP	43	56	76	51	55	67	50				
WHT	40	40		51	57		63				
FRL	36	45	58	43	50	48	48				
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	33	38		24	36						
ELL	14	59	80	34	47	50					
BLK	40	56	50	39	37	32	31				
HSP	52	56		46	50		67				
WHT	53	50		52	32		68				
FRL	46	56	54	42	41	32	49				

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	53

ESSA Federal Index	
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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	42
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	52
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	47
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	40
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	54
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.

In 2018-2019 fifth grade science performed the lowest with 40% of students proficient. This seems to be a trend throughout the state with a decline in science. A contributing factor to our decline in science performance was that the science teacher for 5th grade was out a month before testing due to medical issues.

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

In addition to the drop in proficiency from 50% to 40% in science that is listed above, we also dropped from 58% to 48% proficiency in 5th grade math. We are unsure as to the factor that contributed to this decline.

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.

Fourth grade math had the biggest gap when compared to the state average. Proficiency of fourth grade at Lake Shipp Elementary was 47% in 2018-2019 and the state average was 60% proficiency.

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

Our third and fourth grade math proficiency increased 10% from the previous year. Third grade moved from 48% proficiency to 58% and fourth grade increased from 37% proficiency to 47%. During the 2018-2019 school year we focused on rigorous math instruction, followed the District pacing guides, and monitored student progress with fidelity. Several supplemental programs were used in the classroom to individualize instruction to meet the needs of each student.

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

The performance of our ELA lowest 25% students and the performance of the students with disabilities.

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

1. ELA learning gains for our lowest 25%
2. Small group instruction
3. Rigorous instruction in all areas
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Data shows our lowest 25 % obtains minimal to no growth. Data also show a gap in learning gains. Small group instruction is effective because teaching is focused precisely on what the students need to learn. There are several benefits of small-group instruction, which include more efficient use of teacher and student time, increased instructional time, and more opportunities for students to improve critical academic skills.

Measurable Outcome: Based on weekly, module, and ongoing assessments students should show growth from one assessment to the next. By the end of the year we would expect to see atleast a 5% growth for our lowest 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alyssa Moriarty (alyssa.moriarty@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Differentiated Instruction
Collaborative Planning
Small Group Instruction
Professional Development

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When used effectively and on a consistent basis all of the strategies mentioned above are effective in helping to increase vocabulary, comprehension, math facts, and math vocabulary.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide PD on planning for small group instruction and what it looks like. Additional instructional materials and supplies are purchased to use in small group as well as using Ready Florida materials. Ink and Toner will be purchased for printers to print any necessary materials for the small groups. PD will be provided by our math and reading coaches.

Person Responsible Jane Murphy (jane.murphy@polk-fl.net)

Monitor small group instruction during walkthroughs. These groups will be determined by the Reading Wonders Assessments that are printed by the Print Shop. Is it occurring, what is being taught in these groups, look for changes in groups as data is collected. This will be monitored by both administrators and both coaches when walking classrooms daily.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

Additional small group instruction for the lowest 25% of our students in ELA and Math with the reading interventionist, reading coach, math coach and Title One para.

Person Responsible Alyssa Moriarty (alyssa.moriarty@polk-fl.net)

Insure that inclusion teachers and ELL paras are using researched based strategies during push ins.

Person Responsible Karen Irace (karen.irace@polk-fl.net)

Utilize Ipads in the classroom to provide extra practice on supplemental sites in reading and math.

Person Responsible Sharonda Spencer (sharonda.spencer@polk-fl.net)

BBY math resources are used during math intervention to learn and review number literacy, multiplication facts, geometry and time.

Person Responsible Sharonda Spencer (sharonda.spencer@polk-fl.net)

Utilize the Summer Express Weekly Readers with our lowest 30% over the summer to help decreases the summer slide. Parents will be guided on how to use the booklets and videos will be shared throughout the summer on our Facebook site and Class DoJo.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

Utilize the Summer Express Weekly Readers with our lowest 30% over the summer to help decreases the summer slide. Parents will be guided on how to use the booklets and videos will be shared throughout the summer on our Facebook site and Class DoJo.

Person Responsible Kathryn Raub (kathryn.raub@polk-fl.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Having a positive school environment continues to be an area to improve on. Attendance issues on the campus contributed to a decrease in student achievement. Time was taken from classroom instruction when students are not in attendance.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in attendance 90% of the time or more from 86% to 90%. This will increase the time students receive standards based instruction in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angie Harrison (angela.harrison@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CASEL SElect Program - Sanford Harmony Kit PBiS MTSS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony provides educators with the tools to foster social connections among all students, and to support the social, emotional, and cognitive skills students need to successfully negotiate peer interactions, develop positive peer relationships, and thrive in school. PBiS sees to improve school climate, reduce discipline issues and support academic achievement. MTSS is a framework that we use to provide targeted support to struggling students, the goal is to intervene early so students can catch up with their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Deliver social skills (Harmony) lessons to all students and revisit areas students struggle with monthly by grade level.

Person Responsible Artesha Spencer (artasha.spencer@polk-fl.net)

Review the PBiS framework and continue to assist with implementation throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Karen Irace (karen.irace@polk-fl.net)

Recognize the classroom in each grade level with the highest percentage of attendance monthly and individual students with perfect attendance quarterly.

Person Responsible Angie Harrison (angela.harrison@polk-fl.net)

Host three parent nights on campus to build capacity with parents and community members. We will have a literacy night, math night, and science night . Hands on activities will be planned and sessions on how to help their child be successful at school.

Person Responsible Alyssa Moriarty (alyssa.moriarty@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Within our two areas of focus we are including all four of our highest priorities. Instructional Practice specifically relating to small group instruction includes our lowest 25% in both math and reading along with small group instruction. Culture and Environment specifically relating to student attendance focuses on our last priority which was attendance. Additionally we included rigorous instruction as a priority and is included in everything we do in the classroom.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school has student agendas that are used to communicate with parents on a daily basis as well as a weekly parent communication folder. The folder will be sent home every Wednesday with important information for parents as well as weekly student work. A monthly newsletter will be sent home at the beginning of each month with information about upcoming events as well as activities taking place on campus. Class Dojo is used in all classrooms to communicate with parents, instantly share messages, updates and photos from their class. It is the easiest way to share how children are doing at school and to get in touch with teachers. Four nights are planned to invite parents on campus. Our annual Open House will be in the fall to allow parents to come talk with teachers and visit their child's classroom and school environment. Three other nights are planned; reading, math, and science, to showcase what is covered in these areas and to share ways for parents to help their child at home.

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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00