Chiefland Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Amy Webber

Start Date for this Principal: 1/5/2018

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 (52%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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

Chiefland Elementary School

1205 NW 4TH AVE, Chiefland, FL 32626

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

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	26%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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.

The staff, parents and community work together to ensure the success of all students while cultivating their dreams for tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will be known forever by the tracks we leave.

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
Homan, Michael	Principal	Active participant/leader, to encourage communication between faculty and staff; facilitate the problem solving process; authorize the implementation of ides and the use of resources in the process. Develop the agenda for each leadership team meeting.
Watkins, Aimee	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Gore, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Active participant/leader, to encourage communication between faculty and staff; facilitate the problem solving process; authorize the implementation of ides and the use of resources in the process.
Barron, Michelle	School Counselor	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team.
Beauchamp, Randi	Instructional Coach	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team. Help to determine professional development needs and supports for teachers.
Mitchell, Aimee	Dean	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team.
Rogers, April	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Hardee, Dorie	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Boyd, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Jones, Christy	Teacher, ESE	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Agnoli, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wilson, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Provide input and ideas that the team can implement to solve school-wide problems. Then share information from the meetings with perspective team members concerning the focus of each meeting.
Brady, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Help facilitate the problem-solving process and to provide input regarding services and resources that may be available to the team. Help to determine professional development needs and supports for teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 1/5/2018, Amy Webber

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

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 (52%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (41%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	110	124	117	106	127	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	684
Attendance below 90 percent	44	42	30	28	27	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	12	16	5	15	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in ELA	0	0	13	23	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	9	21	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	19	15	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	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	14	26	13	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
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

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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	117	124	118	102	127	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	690
Attendance below 90 percent	0	51	40	53	43	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	11	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	10	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	7	7	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	5	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	117	124	118	102	127	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	690
Attendance below 90 percent	0	51	40	53	43	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
One or more suspensions	0	4	9	11	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	7	10	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	13	34	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	7	7	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	5	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	48%	49%	57%	44%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	59%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	55%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	58%	63%	52%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	64%	62%	60%	52%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	42%	51%	44%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	50%	53%	48%	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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	57%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	41%	-3%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	45%	44%	1%	56%	-11%
	2018	36%	44%	-8%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	55%	-6%	62%	-13%
	2018	47%	55%	-8%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	59%	-8%	64%	-13%
	2018	46%	59%	-13%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	40%	53%	-13%	60%	-20%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	49%	-7%	53%	-11%
	2018	37%	48%	-11%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	29	48	59	32	54	53	29				
ELL	36	40		64	70						
BLK	33	63		42	63	50	33				
HSP	43			64							
MUL	35			25							
WHT	53	59	64	50	54	44	49				

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
FRL	43	56	63	42	53	44	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	27	42	29	28	20	5	31				
ELL	75			83							
BLK	26	41	50	25	27		20				
HSP	63	64		58	36						
MUL	46			46							
WHT	42	42	48	53	40	32	43				
FRL	37	40	47	46	37	33	35				

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	48	59	35	45	43	16				
BLK	21	45		34	57	60					
HSP	36	56		50	50		58				
MUL	57			56							
WHT	47	51	49	54	60	43	52				
FRL	39	52	58	51	57	43	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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	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	54
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	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	53
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	50
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.

Subgroup: Multiracial in ELA and Math decreased and did not meet the 32% overall. ELA 46%-35%, Math 46%-25%. This a very small subgroup and in tends to fluctuate so it is hard to track. A teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks (2018-19 school year) and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom Math- Proficiency decreased from 50%-48%. A 5th grade teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom (2018-19 school year). In ELA there was a total point gain of 40 and in math only 25. Math is not rising as quickly.

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

The only area with a decline was in Math. Overall proficiency went from 50%-48%. 5th grade had a decrease 48%-40%. A 5th grade teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom. (2018-19 school year)

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.

5th Grade Math: CES 40% State 60% A teacher was removed the end of 1st 9 weeks and a substitute teacher was placed in the classroom. We were unable to find a teacher to complete the school year. (2018-19 school year)

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

Overall was ELA (increase of 40 pts.), but specifically ELA Learning Gains of the Bottom Quartile (18 pts.) we also had specific subgroups that made significant gains. Students were strategically assigned teachers who were strong in this area and were also provided with strategic interventions and groupings throughout the day to provide supports. We continued with these strategies in the 2019-20 school year and school based data (ELA comprehension assessments/ i-Ready data) were evidence that we were maintaining reading levels. Without the last few months of school it is hard to say what the gains would have been. Due to being out of school for several months we will continue

with strategies to recoup and learning lost and get students back on track and beyond.
Subgroups:
SWD- 29%-59% in learning gains ELA of BQ and 20%-54% in math learning gains, 5%-53% in math learning gains of the BQ.
Black- Math learning gains increased 27%-63% and science increased 20%-33%

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

Attendance, with a focus on K-2. In grades 3-5 there are still a high level of level 1 students in ELA and Math even though gains are increasing.

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

1. ELA proficiency. (getting students back to grade level) Due to covid closure we will need to work on student learning gains.
2. Math proficiency with a focus on 5th grade.
3. Multiracial students in ELA and Math.
4. Continuing to increase gains in ELA and Math
5. Attendance for all

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In ELA CES students outperformed goals set for learning gains and gains of the lowest quartile. However, these need to continue to increase for proficiency to improve. Multiracial students decreased in ELA 46%-35%. This data is from the spring of 2019. School based data in the 2019-20 school year shows some increase from previous mid-year however, we know their will be some dip in progress due to the Covid-19 shut down. Due to this concern we will focus on ELA as a driving force with instruction to get students back to grade level and recoup any losses that have occured due to school closure.
Measurable Outcome:	On the FSA spring ELA assessment learning gains for all will increase 58%- 63% for all students and Learning Gains for the bottom quartile will increase 66%-70%. Multiracial students will increase from 35%-40% proficient in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Homan (michael.homan@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue our focus on strategic planning for the core ELA block and interventions with a focus on standards-driven instruction, small groups, and writing to text. Reading coaches work with all grade levels to ensure a common reading block configuration that includes all six areas of reading. This reading block includes small group instruction based on data that is reviewed at least biweekly. All schedules in K-5 include at minimum a 40 minute intervention block to ensure an opportunity for each grade level to work with all students on either foundational skills that have gaps or to provide more opportunities to practice with standards to ensure understanding. Title I tutoring will be offered to groups of students as well as GEER tutoring to support students with any loses due to closure.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Planning standards-based ELA instruction and ensuring that all aspects of the ELA block are taught with fidelity are critical to student success. All strategies discussed are part of the Levy County Reading Plan approved by the State of Florida.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Core lead team will meet 2x per month (min.) to analyze current ELA data (all grades) to determine areas to discuss w/grade levels. Multi-Racial students is a subgroup that is evaluated every week along with all other subgroups.
2. Teams will meet once per month w/Core lead team to make data based decisions to change instruction as necessary.
3. Reading coaches will meet with teams and individuals to support small group planning and intervention planning.
4. Walkthroughs by administration to ensure all aspects of the reading block are being taught with fidelity. This also provides an opportunity to provide feedback in a "coaching" cycle.

Person Responsible	Michael Homan (michael.homan@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance is a concern for our students, particularly with grades K-2. This year will be more difficult than most due to the CDC guidelines that are in place along with the multiple options for learning. We have worked to ensure that there is a plan in place for teachers to have communication for families and follow up with administration to support parents with learning at home as necessary. All students have chromebooks to checkout and access to canvas if they cannot be in school.

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.

CES continually plans with staff, parents, and community members how to improve school culture and increase family and community involvement. PTO (Parent Teacher Organization), SAC (School Advisory Council), and PBS (Positive Behavior Support) are the groups that currently operate.
Our first group project this year involved the community. Coach Spina (PBS Coach) worked in creating a phantom screen that was applied to the front of the school windows and doors in the pickup area. This screen allows for students, staff and others that are located inside the school to see outward, but not allow for vision to those looking inward toward the school. This provides safety and security to our campus as well as "curb" appeal. Our community business partners helped to contribute to the funding of this project and made it a huge success. Businesses in the community also sponsor flower beds throughout the campus. This contributes to the beautification of the school and helps with pride among students and staff. The PBS team with financial support from local businesses have also been able to set up movement paths on campus. The PBS team will continue with Student of the Month revolving around a character trait, school store/tribal tokens, and end of fnine week reward days this school year.
Many of our students have social/emotional/and financial needs that need to be met. Various agencies help us to provide assistance to families in need. We are able to keep a clothes closet for students who come to school inappropriately dressed for the weather or are in clothes that are dirty and/or ill-fitting. Our school participates in the Food for Kids Backpack (sponsored by community business members) program which supplies food for students who do not have access to food during weekends and school holidays. We have approximately 150 students/families enrolled in the program. This summer the Food of the Almighty have partnered with us to provides groceries and other household supplies for both students and staff families in need. With their grant they were able to purchase a refrigerator that we keep on campus.
Our community does not hesitate to reach out and support the school to ensure all students are safe, have basic needs met and are able to access the education here at CES.

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
		Total:	**$0.00**