Quiet Waters Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Quiet Waters Elementary School

4150 W HILLSBORO BLVD, Deerfield Beach, FL 33442

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Geoffrey Henning

Start Date for this Principal: 4/10/2015

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)	90%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 is pending approval by the Broward 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

Quiet Waters Elementary School

4150 W HILLSBORO BLVD, Deerfield Beach, FL 33442

[no web address on file]

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	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

Quiet Waters Elementary School's students, staff, parents, and community will strive to ensure that all students reach their maximum potential in a safe and nurturing learning environment.

• We believe the basic skills in reading, writing, and math are the foundation of education.
• We believe all members of the school community should respect themselves and others.
• We believe educational decisions need to be based on individual student needs.
• We believe parents, staff, students and the community are a team that share the responsibility for each student's achievement.
• We believe it is our responsibility to meet the challenges of change and keep abreast of current educational research and strategies.
• We believe a safe and nurturing environment is needed to promote learning.
• We believe in the importance of creating an environment, which accepts and respects the diversity of all individuals.
• We believe the curriculum support classes play an integral part of a well-balanced education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a positive teaching and learning environment that fosters self-motivated and life-long learners.

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
Henning, Geoff	Principal	
Reliford, Ramona	Assistant Principal	
Cohen, Nina	Instructional Coach	
Lizano, Denise	Assistant Principal	
Blankenship, Kristen	Instructional Coach	
Chin, Nydia	Other	
Gussack, Jennifer	Other	
Donahue, Sue	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 4/10/2015, Geoffrey Henning

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

69

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)	90%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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	149	168	194	178	174	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1025
Attendance below 90 percent	30	11	21	27	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	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		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	1	5	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	162	204	195	184	150	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1089
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	11	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	45	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	1	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	162	204	195	184	150	194	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1089
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	11	8	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	26	45	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	7	1	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	58%	59%	57%	55%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	60%	58%	55%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	54%	53%	36%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	65%	65%	63%	59%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	66%	62%	60%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	51%	43%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	46%	53%	46%	45%	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	57%	60%	-3%	58%	-1%
	2018	50%	59%	-9%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	57%	62%	-5%	58%	-1%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	53%	59%	-6%	56%	-3%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	65%	-7%	62%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	67%	-5%	64%	-2%
	2018	61%	63%	-2%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	66%	64%	2%	60%	6%
	2018	64%	62%	2%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	15	29	24	31	50	47	21				
ELL	49	56	43	59	66	54	36				
ASN	83	93		83	86						
BLK	47	54	35	50	57	46	29				
HSP	56	55	45	66	68	53	43				
MUL	58	88		58	82		33				
WHT	67	74	56	75	73	64	65				
FRL	51	56	37	60	67	54	36				
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	14	35	41	25	57	47	26				
ELL	33	56	62	48	62	56	33				
ASN	74	83		74	77		73				
BLK	47	56	44	39	65	56	41				
HSP	55	61	60	60	71	56	53				
MUL	26	40		37	47						
WHT	64	60	59	76	81	63	66				

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	51	59	54	58	71	58	51				

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	9	33	28	24	43	41	18				
ELL	36	47	48	46	55	47	21				
ASN	72	47		89	80						
BLK	33	39	18	40	45	34	21				
HSP	58	62	53	55	62	45	47				
MUL	56			50							
WHT	64	56	35	73	63	48	59				
FRL	50	51	38	54	58	40	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	59
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	54
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	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
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	57
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	64
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	67
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	53
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.

The component with the lowest performance was our ELA Lowest 25th percentile. Many of the students included in this group are ESE and ELL students. Some contributing factors include their lack of grade-level appropriate academic vocabulary, their ability to respond to reading with required writing skills, students are exhibiting reading deficiencies of two years of more below grade level, students may lack access to resources and experiences to support learning outside of school, and the limited use of guided reading within small group instruction.

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

The data components that showed the greatest decline are ELA Lowest 25th percentile and Science Achievement. Both dropped 8 percentages points. Some contributing factors include a lack of use of test specs, lack of rigor and integration of science across the curriculum, the lack of grade-level appropriate academic vocabulary, their ability to respond to reading with required writing skills, students are exhibiting reading deficiencies of two years of more below grade level, students may lack access to resources and experiences to support learning outside of school.

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.

When comparing school data to the state averages, the greatest gaps are: ELA Learning Gains (-6 percentage points), ELA Lowest 25th percentile (-6 percentage points), and Math Learning Gain (-6 percentage points). The factors that contributed are: lack of grade-level appropriate academic vocabulary, students' ability to respond to reading with required writing skills, lack of retention of concepts, and students may lack access to resources and experiences to support learning outside of school.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Achievement with a four percentage point gain. The actions taken that lead to this increase include: more teachers attending district-based professional development focusing on math, the implementation of small groups during math instruction, and the implementation of Reflex math allowing students to master math fluency facts.

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

According to data on the early warning signs indicators, attendance would be a potential area of concern as well as the number of students with two or more retentions.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile

3. SWD subgroup
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase ELA proficiency for lowest 25th percentile- Based on a review of school data, there was an eight percentage point decrease between 2018 and 2019 in ELA proficiency for our lowest 25th percentile.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, 50% of students in the lowest 25th percentile will demonstrate proficiency based on the results of FSA ELA Spring 2021 assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Geoff Henning (geoffrey.henning@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All students will receive small group differentiated instruction to the meet their individual needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction allows students to have personalized instruction to address their strengths and weakness as identified by progress monitoring data. This approach will close specific learning gaps leading to a greater proficiency rate.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student data to identify teaching targets through grade level data chats and weekly RtI meetings
2. Increase teacher knowledge of small group guided reading through district and school-based professional development, PLCs, and collaborative planning
3. Regularly review current progress monitoring student data and make instructional adjustments based on the data
4. Increase teacher knowledge of FSA test specs
5. Increase the utilization of higher-level strategies and rigorous questioning

Person Responsible	Geoff Henning (geoffrey.henning@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase the proficiency of Science Achievement - Based on a review of school data, there was an eight percentage point decrease between the 2018 and 2019 Science Achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, 51% of students will demonstrate proficiency based on the results of the NGSSS Statewide Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Geoff Henning (geoffrey.henning@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Science instruction will be integrated across all grade-levels and all areas of curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By improving the integration of science in all classrooms and all curriculum areas, students will be able to make deeper connections to the application of science. Reading comprehension is essential to success on the science assessment and by integrating literacy instruction with science content, students build skills in both areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student data to identify teaching targets through grade level data chats
2. Teachers will attend district-based professional development on science and literacy integration
3. Utilize Mastery Connect to design, administer, and review student assessments and data in the area of Science
4. Collaboration with classroom teachers, Science teacher, and STEM teacher
5. Deepen teacher knowledge of district-adopted STEMscopes program

Person Responsible	Geoff Henning (geoffrey.henning@browardschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	To increase ELA proficiency of SWD subgroup- Based on a review of school data, 15% of our SWD students are proficient in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2021, 20% of students in the SWD subgroup will demonstrate proficiency based on the results of FSA ELA Spring 2021 assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Geoff Henning (geoffrey.henning@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction and collaboration between general education and special education staff will be implemented in addition to pull out services to provide support for students in their area of need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that collaboration among general and special education staff provide learning supports that benefit students with and without disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student data to determine who would most benefit from pull out or push in instruction
2. Built school master schedule to meet needs of those selected
3. Regularly review current progress monitoring data and make group and instructional adjustments based on the data
4. Increase the utilization of effective instructional strategies to be used during small group instruction

Person Responsible	Geoff Henning (geoffrey.henning@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team has conducted a needs analysis review of school-wide data to determine areas to focus on during the 2020-2021 school year. To address these areas, progress monitoring data will be collected and reviewed on an ongoing basis to make necessary instructional adjustments to support student achievement. The school leadership will work in a collaborative capacity with teachers to improve these areas of need. School leadership will continue to identify and support the implementation of research-based programs, engaging instructional practices, and authentic learning opportunities for students.

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.

Building positive working relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders is essential to fulfill the school's mission and to meet the needs of students. Parents are invited to become active members of the School Advisory Council and encouraged to provide input in the development and decision-making process of the School Improvement Plan. The school will schedule meetings to be held at various times during the day or evening to better accommodate parents including an orientation for parents at each grade level to inform them about the school's participation in the Title I program and to encourage parents to be involved with reviewing and revising of the School's Title I Plan. Teachers hold conferences individually with parents of children in their classrooms. Parents will be given a summary of the students test scores and an explanation of the interventions that teachers are using to assist the child in reaching achievement goals. Parents will be asked to engage in discussion of how they can support these efforts. Parents will also be given suggestions for coordinating school-parent efforts and explanations of homework and grading procedures. The school will offer parents a special workshop each year to provide an explanation of statewide assessment systems, standards, and other accountability measures. Also, the school will host several parent sessions on the following topics: the Florida Standards Assessment, Parent Technology Academy, as well as School Safety. Quiet Waters Elementary will also offer staff training to assist teachers in understanding the value of positive parent relationships with a specific focus on effective communication and social emotional learning.

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				$18,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$7,000.00
			Notes: I-Ready Toolbox (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$0.00
			Notes: I-Ready Diagnostic & Instruction (Instructional Technology)			

			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,500.00
			Notes: Flocabulary (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,250.00
			Notes: Vocabulary/Spelling City (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$0.00
			Notes: Mastery Connect (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$3,500.00
			Notes: Digital Coach (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,950.00
			Notes: BrainPop (Instructional Technology)			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$3,745.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$0.00
			Notes: Mastery Connect (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,950.00
			Notes: BrainPop (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$795.00
			Notes: Generation Genius (Instructional Technology)			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$18,200.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$7,000.00
			Notes: I-Ready Toolbox (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$0.00
			Notes: I-Ready Diagnostic & Instruction (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,500.00
			Notes: Flocabulary (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,250.00
			Notes: Vocabulary/SpellingCity (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$0.00

			Notes: Mastery Connect (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$3,500.00
			Notes: Digital Coach (Instructional Technology)			
			3121 - Quiet Waters Elementary School	Other		$2,950.00
			Notes: BrainPop (Instructional Technology)			
					Total:	**$40,145.00**