

Volusia County Schools

# George W. Marks Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

Principal: Shannon Young

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

## George W. Marks Elementary School

1000 N GARFIELD AVE, Deland, FL 32724

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/georgemarks/pages/default.aspx>

### 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	No	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

### 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 Volusia 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.

Through the cooperative support of the school, family, and community, our students will develop academic and citizenship skills to become productive members of society.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

George Marks Elementary, where everyone succeeds together!

### 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
YOUNG, SHANNON	Principal	Meet to determine student needs through data analysis and build a positive culture and climate for all stakeholders.
Beeghly, Elaine	Assistant Principal	
Linan, Becky	Teacher, K-12	
Cone, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Heffernan, Jill	Teacher, K-12	
Westervelt, Amanda	School Counselor	
Veitch, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Manning, Laura	Teacher, K-12	
Simon, Diane	Teacher, K-12	
Hurst, Janet	Teacher, K-12	
Priddy, Becky	Teacher, K-12	
Murray, Julie	Instructional Coach	
Rosekelly, Lori	Teacher, ESE	

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Shannon Young

**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.*

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	58	81	95	92	82	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	10	11	11	8	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	14	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	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	3	4	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	6	3	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

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	66	101	69	78	92	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	12	28	13	15	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

**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	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	66	101	69	78	92	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	12	28	13	15	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

**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	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	56%	57%	57%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	48%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	53%	33%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	59%	63%	59%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	56%	62%	44%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	29%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	57%	53%	60%	59%	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	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	63%	58%	5%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	55%	2%
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	25	31	38	27	50	46	14				
ELL	46	35		51	42						
BLK	45	57		42	55		36				
HSP	49	39	30	53	44	27	50				
MUL	38			31							
WHT	65	57	52	66	70	57	53				
FRL	53	49	44	52	52	37	40				
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	21	34	33	26	39	41	30				
ELL	31	48	46	43	59	45	23				
BLK	50	43		56	40						
HSP	44	54	38	46	46	37	44				
MUL	20			40							
WHT	57	50	38	60	50	39	67				
FRL	44	42	38	50	45	36	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	24	38	35	28	32	23	32				
ELL	24	33	27	39	38	33					
BLK	43	50		57	42						
HSP	38	38	22	49	38	29	41				
MUL	40										
WHT	65	50	38	61	43	28	65				
FRL	48	45	33	51	38	30	53				

### 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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	45
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	35
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	60
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	49
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.**

Math lowest quartile (learning gains) was the data component that had the lowest performance

EWS showed 54 students with an attendance rate of less than 90% and 31 students with 2 or more indicators.

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

Science was the data component that had the greatest decline from the prior year.

EWS showed 54 students with an attendance rate of less than 90% and 31 students with 2 or more indicators.

**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.**

Math was the data component that had the greatest gap when compared with state data.

EWS showed 54 students with an attendance rate of less than 90% and 31 students with 2 or more indicators. 37 students scored level 1 on FSA Math

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

The most improvement was shown in math learning gains.

School wide intervention time slots, frequent data chats

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

EWS showed 54 students with an attendance rate of less than 90% and 31 students with 2 or more indicators.

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

1. Professional learning on teaching students with poverty
2. Data collection and analyzing for student intervention groups
3. Professional learning for math intervention/enrichment strategies
4. Professional learning for social emotional learning
5. Monitor standards based instruction

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Low proficiency rates on FSA for the 2019 school year in math, specifically in the lowest quartile, SWD and multiracial students
---	--

<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We will monitor progress using various district assessments to increase proficiency rates from 36% to 50%.
----------------------------	--

<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---	---

<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Pre and post assessments to monitor student achievement in math subgroups (multiracial and SWD)
-------------------------------------	---

<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Evidence from data collection showed the following populations (SWD and multiracial) were under performing other subgroups on math standard based criteria
---	--

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review data for 2019 and 2020
2. Schedule professional development (Canvas Resources: specifically newly added topic assessments, SchoolCity, Teaching students in Poverty, Zearn
3. Administer iReady to establish student groups (ABC group model)
4. Conduct grade level monitoring during PLC
5. Establish tutoring for targeted students outside the normal school day
6. Monitor standards based instruction during intervention time with on-going walk-throughs and feedback

<b>Person Responsible</b>	SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)
---------------------------	---

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus**

**Description and Rationale:** Low proficiency rates on FSSA for 2019 in the SWD and Black subgroups

**Measurable Outcome:**

With the support of the district science department, we will review the standards with the lowest performance and address those school-wide, Using the VST's and formative assessments we will monitor student progress quarterly so that student achievement increases on FSSA from 14% to 54% proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Pre and post assessments to monitor student achievement in science subgroups (SWD and black)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Evidence from data collection showed the following populations (SWD and multiracial) were under performing other subgroups on math standard based criteria

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review 2018 and 2019 data to identify focus standards
2. Add a special area science rotation for hands-on activities in every grade level
3. Schedule professional learning for SchoolCity data program, Canvas Resources and teaching students in poverty
4. Administer SMT and/or pretests to determine baseline data for student groups
5. Conduct grade level progress monitoring during PLC
6. Conduct intervention days based on the focus standards
7. Establish tutoring for targeted students outside of the school day
8. Implement school-wide hands on activities weekly in every classroom (in addition to special area)
8. Monitor standards based instruction through on-going walk-throughs and feedback

**Person Responsible**

SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In 2019 there was an increase in office referrals, out of school suspensions and absenteeism in the lowest 25% of student population

**Measurable Outcome:** With the help of the school guidance counselor, district mental health resources and PBIS professional learning, we will reduce the amount of out of school suspensions, office referrals and absenteeism in the lowest quartile by 20%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementing a new PBIS system, SEL time for each classroom on the master schedule, small group counseling sessions with the school counselor added to the school counselor schedule

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** EWS report showed a need for attendance and behavior interventions

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Review EWS data
2. Add SEL time to the master calendar
3. Remove guidance counselor from special are rotation to add for more small group counseling
4. School wide PBIS implementation
5. Professional learning on strategies to use with students in poverty

**Person Responsible** SHANNON YOUNG (sbyoung@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**School wide PBIS implemented to decrease classroom distractions and increase student engagement, thus improving SEL and attendance ratings**

**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.

GME addresses a positive school culture by daily SEL time, PBIS, professional learning designed to promote a positive school culture. We also involve PTA and SAC to assist in involving parents and community members through monthly free events.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

### **Part V: Budget**

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00