

Clay County Schools

Keystone Heights Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Keystone Heights Elementary

335 SW PECAN ST, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khe.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Turbeville

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	99%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Keystone Heights Elementary

335 SW PECAN ST, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

<http://khe.oneclay.net>

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-6	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Keystone Heights Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Lavin, Corinne	Principal	The principal is responsible for leading instruction in the school, ensuring facilities and operations are in order, talent management through recruiting and retaining highly effective faculty and staff, and building the culture of the school.
Gillenwaters, Missy	Teacher, K-12	Title I Lead Teacher, Plan Parent Events, Tutoring Coordinator, Small Group Instruction
Williams, Kayleigh	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in leading instruction in the school, ensuring facilities and operations are in order, talent management through recruiting and retaining highly effective faculty and staff, and building the culture of the school.
Kirkland, Brandi	Teacher, K-12	Small Group Instruction
Cumbus, Jenn	Teacher, K-12	Small Groups Instruction
Dampier, Anna	School Counselor	All duties guidance, MTSS, behavioral Support, Testing
Gibson, Heather	School Counselor	All duties guidance, MTSS, behavioral Support, Testing
Morford, Isaac	Instructional Coach	Behavioral Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/31/2020, Elizabeth Turbeville

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.*

8

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	99%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	113	101	97	106	106	112	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	762
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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 9/11/2020

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	112	105	122	104	109	139	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	8	9	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	112	105	122	104	109	139	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	831
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	7	4	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	9	5	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	68%	65%	57%	67%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	62%	58%	69%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	65%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	80%	70%	63%	72%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	66%	62%	75%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	56%	51%	66%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	65%	53%	68%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	64%	68%	-4%	58%	6%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	58%	6%
	2018	73%	62%	11%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	67%	62%	5%	56%	11%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	69%	64%	5%	54%	15%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	71%	4%	62%	13%
	2018	75%	70%	5%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	69%	10%	64%	15%
	2018	74%	66%	8%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	77%	64%	13%	60%	17%
	2018	83%	65%	18%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
06	2019	88%	70%	18%	55%	33%
	2018	81%	68%	13%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	63%	13%	53%	23%
	2018	78%	64%	14%	55%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	49	48	42	57	57	54	70				
BLK	47	50		56	69						
HSP	67	57		81	78						
MUL	91			100							
WHT	68	58	49	80	75	67	80				
FRL	65	59	53	74	72	64	75				

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	53	59	55	60	66	77	58				
BLK	58	60		42	40						
HSP	71	75		71	83						
WHT	68	63	52	81	82	84	81				

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
FRL	63	60	57	75	80	83	78				
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	43	62	66	62	72	61	45				
BLK	50	55		56	82						
HSP	53	64		65	79						
MUL	42	60		92	80						
WHT	69	70	66	72	75	63	69				
FRL	62	66	63	68	73	65	61				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	478
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	56
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	71
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	96
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
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	66
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.

Our ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% showed that lowest overall performance. Over the past several years, we have hovered around 50/55% but dropped to 49% two years ago. We struggle to find reasons for this gap, although we suspect an imbalance of intervention time and grade level work was at least partly to blame.

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

Our Math learning gains for the lowest 25% showed the greatest decline from the previous year. We had massive gains the year before and they leveled out some this past year. We also had a few teacher changes in upper grades math in order to build capacity. We expected a slight drop.

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.

Our ELA learning gains for our lowest 25% showed the largest gap compared to the state average. We struggle to find reasons for this gap, although we suspect an imbalance of intervention time and grade level work was at least partly to blame.

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

Our overall ELA and Math achievement (proficiency) both improved by one point. We continue to focus on teacher collaboration through common planning and professional learning communities where teachers delve into standards, create common assessments, and assess student work.

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

Attendance and discipline go hand in hand and unfortunately several students with excessive absences also have discipline issues which sometimes merit suspensions. We focus on non-exclusionary discipline practices when possible in order to keep students in class.

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

1. ELA lowest 25th percentile learning gains
2. Overall ELA learning gains
3. ELA proficiency
4. Math lowest 25th percentile learning gains
5. Student social emotional awareness and regulation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we increase the quality of small group/differentiated instruction in ELA classes, our lower quartile students will show more improvement. Our lower quartile students are some of our most fragile learners and they need quality small group instruction based on data and using research based materials.
Measurable Outcome:	Our ELA lower quartile learning gains were 49% in 18/19. We plan to improve this number to at least 51% in 20/21.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Corinne Lavin (corinne.lavin@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction informed by data from iReady/Achieve 3000 and using evidence based lessons form LAFS, iReady toolbox, FOCUS from Curriculum Associates, and Phonics for Learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady, Achieve, LAFS are all aligned to the state standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly PLC meetings
2. Common Planning
3. Data meetings/Data tracking document
4. KHE hires additional paraprofessionals to assist in LLI groups and who assist in small group instructional groups.
5. AR is needed to assist in student engagement.
6. LAFS for 1st grade will be utilized in class to assist with standards to be taught.
7. FOCS Math and Reading books with small groups on certain skills they are struggling with.
8. Learning A-Z and Starfall are resources that are used in lab and classroom settings to help with our Pre-K-Second grade students with differentiating instruction.
9. Charging Carts/Stations are needed for teachers to share chromebooks amongst teachers to be able to wheel them from class to class safely.
10. Tech Needs for more hands on activities using large monitors for students to see and manipulate on screens.

Person Responsible Corinne Lavin (corinne.lavin@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When students are aware and can regulate their own social emotional wellbeing, the school is safer and the overall environment is improved. Last school year we had 700 Indian Pride feather sheets. This year we will have 760 Indian Pride sheets.

Measurable Outcome: There will be an increase of at least 5% (60) of instances of students completing their Indian Pride sheets (collecting all 6 feathers by exhibiting positive behaviors.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Corinne Lavin (corinne.lavin@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue using our school wide behavior plan based on PBIS (specifically Foundations) principles, CHAMPS in classrooms, and 7 Mindsets.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our PBIS plan addresses the 5 Social Emotional Learning competencies as outlined by CASEL.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Indian Pride lesson taught by teachers in the classroom.
2. Indian 200 Club PBIS program ongoing throughout the year.
3. Champs training for teachers for behavior support in classrooms.

Person Responsible: Corinne Lavin (corinne.lavin@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to STEAM Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Through incorporation of STEAM elements, our students are provided with additional science, technology, arts, engineering and math exposure.

Measurable Outcome: We plan to maintain our 80% math proficiency and 79% proficiency in Science, but striding for a 2% increase in scores from two years ago on FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Corinne Lavin (corinne.lavin@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will continue to incorporate STEAM elements into all of our resource classes (including PE, media, technology, STEM, art, music.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Since including STEAM elements into our resource classes, our science and math proficiencies have increased. Math proficiency has improved from 57% in the 14/15 school year to 80% in the 18/19 school year and Science proficiency has improved from 60% in the 14/15 school year to 79% in the 18/19 school year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Resource common planning/PLC weekly
2. Science & Math vertical PLCs quarterly
3. Chromebooks to assist in schoolwide online instructional paths
4. PearDeck provides high quality academic experiences using technology.
5. Continue to use Title I funds to support the hire of our STEM teacher which supports our STEM initiatives.
6. Students will use Discovery Education to support differentiating groups and use of educational videos. Discovery Education will provide supplement materials for the classrooms.

Person Responsible Corinne Lavin (corinne.lavin@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administration will meet with grade level teams weekly in PLC's and quarterly data meetings to discuss needs.

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.

School Administration held a meet and greet for all incoming kindergarten students and parents along with any new student to our school and parent from grades 1-6. We will extend an open invitation to all parents and families to join both our Parent Faculty Association as well as the School Advisory Council. SAC committee meets quarterly to discuss our Title I program. In the beginning of the year, we discuss our PFEP. We like to get parent input on the events and everything that we offer at our school and what additional educational events that they may like to see at our school. We meet with SAC throughout the year to discuss how our programs are working and if there is anything else that they see teachers may need to meet the needs of the students. Within our meetings we discuss budget depending on the programs or events that parents would like to see at our school. The teachers in grades 3rd-6th use planners in order to communicate with families while the lower grades use a daily folder. Tuesday folders are sent home to all students each week and contain both communication and graded work. Many of our teachers also use a technology based system for parent communication provided by the district, Blackboard. Some teachers may use Class Dojo or Remind aps. Our school stakeholders have a Back to School Clothes and Supplies Drive for our local schools. Our local business owners donate prizes for our positive behavior system, Indian 200 winners. Kiwanis donated a Gaga Pit along with sand for our students at recess. They donated money for cleaning supplies as well. We receive feedback from our families at the end of each parent/family event by surveys we provide. If it is a Google Meet, we provide a Google form for parents to respond by. Within SAC meetings, parents share their input about needs and wants for our school and we vote as a group what's best. If revisions are to be made to our PFEP, again we hold a SAC meeting and get approval from members that are present. Again this has been in person, but we currently work from Google Meets.

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: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: STEAM Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00