

Manatee County Public Schools

# H. S. Moody 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>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

## H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

<https://www.manateeschools.net/moody>

### Demographics

**Principal: Natalie Jadid**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2017

<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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</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, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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>18</b>

## H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

<https://www.manateeschools.net/moody>

### 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	74%

### 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 Manatee 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.

Moody Elementary will be an enthusiastic community of lifelong learners where dedication, collaboration, and high expectations will develop independent thinkers and empower tomorrow's leaders.

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

Our vision is for students to use their thinking and problem solving skills to persevere in meeting their goals.

### 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
Stancil, Tina	Principal	Responsible for the safety and learning of students in grades PK through fifth. The principal oversees the instruction and assessments for every grade level; evaluates the effectiveness of all instructional staff members; follows state guidelines for safety and security; schedules and leads the School Advisory Council; responsible for the development and implementation of the Title I plan.
Chapin-Clarke, Emily	Teacher, K-12	Point person for first grade team, support and monitoring use of PBIS
Sanchez, Rebeca	Teacher, K-12	Point person for second grade team, ESOL resource teacher- monitoring achievement of ELLs
Baker, Maidie	Assistant Principal	Monitoring instruction and assessments, grade level point person for fourth grade.
Vicencio, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Grade level point person for fifth grade, support person for ELA coaching, part of MTSS team

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 8/20/2017, Natalie Jadid

**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.*

0

**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.*

0

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

33

### 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* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</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	62	88	86	96	80	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	5	25	14	18	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	9	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	8	10	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/4/2020

### 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	94	95	96	108	94	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	21	19	21	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	2	11	16	13	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

**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	1	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

**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	18	0	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	

**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	94	95	96	108	94	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	21	19	21	17	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	123
One or more suspensions	2	11	16	13	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
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	43	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

**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	1	5	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

**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	18	0	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	

## 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	36%	52%	57%	41%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	57%	58%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	55%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	63%	63%	49%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	56%	68%	62%	53%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	53%	51%	53%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	48%	53%	31%	42%	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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	65%	-9%	64%	-8%
	2018	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
	2018	58%	58%	0%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	32%	48%	-16%	53%	-21%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	16	34	36	24	39	30	22				
ELL	24	40	44	39	54	45	16				
BLK	19	31	50	27	41	40					
HSP	33	48	36	47	58	40	37				
MUL	42	46		58	62						
WHT	49	58	55	63	59		48				
FRL	35	49	46	48	56	37	31				
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	43	43	37	54	43	52				
ELL	22	38	44	39	40	32	17				
BLK	22	44	46	33	38	38	22				
HSP	40	46	42	52	55	32	46				
MUL	33			56							
WHT	60	64	58	65	64		67				
FRL	38	49	45	49	52	38	42				

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	47	46	29	55	53	13				
ELL	14	50	55	35	53	43	7				
BLK	29	33	55	29	33	33	12				
HSP	32	50	50	43	59	56	29				
MUL	50	50		33							
WHT	57	60	50	66	56	70	39				
FRL	35	49	47	45	54	54	26				

### 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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	361
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	52
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	55
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	45
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.**

A- There are four areas of the school grade that are of particular concern: ELA proficiency, ELA and math gains of the lowest quartile and science proficiency. A trend is that we are not able to score at least 60 percent of the lowest quartile making learning gains.

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

B- The area with the greatest decline was science, dropping from 48% proficient in 2018 to 34% proficient in 2019. The score of 48% proficient in 2018 was the highest percent proficient for the previous three years. This percentage mirrored the percent proficient of fifth graders who were proficient in ELA. In 2019, the percentage of fifth graders proficient was 36%.

**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.**

C- ELA proficiency has the greatest gap comparing school data to state data. The school's percent proficient decreased by six percentile points from 2018. The percent proficient in 2018 was 42. There had been a small, but steady increase. A factor that may have contributed to the decline was a turnover rate of 50% in the teachers on staff at the school in grades fourth and fifth.

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

D- The one area that showed improvement was in math learning gains by two percentile points. The school implemented an additional half hour of math instruction in grades three through five. This additional half hour is dedicated to ability grouping.

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

1. The percentage of fifth graders who were a level one on the FSA ELA in 2019 was 32% of the current population.
2. A lack of data from 2020 to know the performance levels of current fourth graders.

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

1. Increase FSA ELA scores in proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains for the lowest quartile.
2. Increase FSA math scores in proficiency, learning gains, and learning gains for the lowest quartile.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

The instructional practice that will be an area of focus for this school year will be to provide relevant tasks to include written responses. Research tells us that writing has the greatest engagement with the brain and provides rich evidence of student learning. Based on walkthroughs and observations, the tasks that students are provided are not always relevant and rigorous with writing. There are times that the tasks are low-level compliance based tasks that permit the teacher to work with small groups. The percent of proficient students has declined over the past few years. With the 2019-2020 school year ending with everyone working online and no reliable end of year 2019-2020, data we are concerned that student achievement in reading has continued to decrease. Additionally, we want to ensure with any of the instructional methods being provided this year, students are authentically engaged with the work.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By June 2021, 45% of students will be proficient in reading. Learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains of fifth graders will be 60%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Quarterly grade level planning and semi-monthly professional development to focus on relevant tasks that are rigorous and incorporate writing.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

With common planning we are working to eliminate variances within the grade level and across grade level. School based professional development also allows for work that is aligned within grade levels and across grade levels. Planning with teams using the District roadmaps and state standards allows administration and coaches to work along with grade level teams on the decisions of relevant tasks to prepare students for common assessments.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Schedule grade level quarterly planning in ELA and Math
2. Schedule semi-monthly professional development
3. Monitor grade level assignments

**Person Responsible**

Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)



## #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We will initiate a monthly character education program called Character Strong. There are weekly and monthly lessons that will be organized by Moody Elementary's school counselors and provided to teachers. The school counselors will also provide a monthly lesson to the class. Social Emotional Learning is relevant to Moody as we continue to decrease our office discipline referrals. We needed a program that would support a school wide focus as well as meeting the needs of each grade level. Given the current educational landscape, it is even more important that we are explicit with our instruction for SEL. This program was introduced by the District's School Climate Coordinator.

**Measurable Outcome:** By June 2021, there will be a 25% decrease in the number of office discipline referrals and out-of-school suspensions from 2019-2020.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

Weekly lessons from an SEL curriculum with supporting monthly lessons from school counselors.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

There has been a steady increase in the number of students with office discipline referrals due to disrespect to peers and adults. This curriculum is a resource to have common language across grade levels and school-wide. This program is supported by the District's Climate Coordinator.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly character focus lessons provided to classrooms teachers by the school counselors.
2. Monthly classroom lessons provided by the school counselors.

### Person

**Responsible** Tina Stancil (stancilt@manateeschools.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Each member of the school leadership team supports a grade level team. A member of the SLT meets with each grade level on a weekly basis. A member of administration is present for quarterly planning of ELA and math. During planning sessions we are creating common assessments.**

## 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.

This year we will use our monthly school newsletter to communicate the Annual Title I meeting, School Advisory Council meetings, and Family Engagement opportunities. The platform we will use for these events will be Teams. Families will have the option of providing their e-mail address to receive the Teams link and they will be provided the phone number to call into the Teams meeting.

This year we have also initiated a school wide communication system through Class Tag. Families who sign on to Class Tag for each teacher will receive regular class updates. The families may also use this app to reach out to the teacher in a texting format to receive quicker responses. Class Tag can also be used to upload videos for families. These videos can be academic and social in nature. Additionally, Class Tag can provide school-wide notices.

#### **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: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00