

Bay District Schools

Patronis Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Patronis Elementary School

7400 PATRONIS DR, Panama City Beach, FL 32408

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brooke Loyed

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

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

Patronis Elementary School

7400 PATRONIS DR, Panama City Beach, FL 32408

[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 KG-5	No	53%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission statement is Patronis Elementary School teachers, administrators, parents, and the community share the responsibility to provide a variety of curriculum, instructional, and assessment opportunities with the high expectation for every student to become a competent self-directed lifelong learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe each student is important; Every student can learn; Some students need more time; All students can become responsible for their learning; Learning takes place in an orderly, caring environment. We also share in the district vision/mission of Every Child, Every Day.

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
Spivey, Ellie	Principal	
Loyed, Brooke	Assistant Principal	
Hull, Anna	Teacher, K-12	
Senn, Carol	Instructional Media	
Vines, Cyrethia	Teacher, K-12	
Mathis, Michele	Teacher, ESE	
Porter, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	
Holbrook, Debra	Teacher, K-12	
Good, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Jackson, Katy	Teacher, K-12	
West, Lori	Teacher, K-12	
Liggin, Chip	Teacher, K-12	
Kirkland, Kenneth	Teacher, K-12	
Parsons, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	
Bray, Christina	Teacher, K-12	
McKenzie, Katie	Teacher, K-12	
Ankoviak, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Talano, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/28/2020, Brooke Loyed

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (71%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	92	104	85	84	90	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	9	25	20	21	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	3	6	8	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	6	6	7	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/31/2020

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	100	125	107	111	117	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	692
Attendance below 90 percent	18	21	16	21	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	100	125	107	111	117	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	692
Attendance below 90 percent	18	21	16	21	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	2	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	76%	55%	57%	71%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	59%	58%	59%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	57%	53%	41%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	56%	63%	73%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	54%	62%	65%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	42%	51%	41%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	53%	53%	61%	44%	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	77%	61%	16%	58%	19%
	2018	85%	57%	28%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	58%	19%	58%	19%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	68%	56%	12%	56%	12%
	2018	71%	50%	21%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	92%	63%	29%	62%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	59%	25%	64%	20%
	2018	79%	59%	20%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	65%	54%	11%	60%	5%
	2018	79%	57%	22%	61%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	54%	5%	53%	6%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	59	56	50	78	58	67	47				
HSP	80	43		75	31						
MUL	72	71		76	79						
WHT	75	64	58	79	65	66	59				
FRL	66	58	65	71	56	60	47				
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	52	53	48	74	63	53	47				
BLK	41			63							
HSP	64	93		76	71						
MUL	68	64		72	90						
WHT	77	65	48	87	80	68	77				
FRL	62	58	43	76	78	70	64				

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	42	51	36	49	43	35	32				
BLK	38	50		46	50						
HSP	70	64		74	50						
MUL	58	60		42	47						
WHT	74	58	38	75	67	46	63				
FRL	59	49	37	62	56	39	47				

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	67
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	469
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
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 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	75
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	60
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.

Science Achievement (60%) and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (61%) were our two lowest data components. Science was down 12 points. However, ELA Lowest 25th Percentile was actually up 10 points (from 51% last year). Due to Hurricane Michael, the lost weeks of instruction had a direct impact on our science curriculum and ELA curriculum. Covid 19 (Spring 2019) kept us from obtaining 2019 data.

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

Math Learning Gains (all students) had the greatest decline from the prior year (down from 79% to 65% 14points). Again, loss of instructional time due to Hurricane Michael had an impact since math is such a building curriculum. Due to Covid 19, no FSA data in 2019.

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.

Although we were higher than the state and district averages in all areas, we were closer to the state average in Math Learning Gains (all students). We were above the state average by 3pts.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement with a ten point increase over last year. Even though it was our lowest area percentage wise, we are very proud of the improvements made due to an emphasis in last year's SIP to focus on this group. Our ESE and MTSS intervention students comprised the majority of the list. We dedicated man power, resources, creative scheduling, and other such things to help with these increases. We kept a current and fluid list of low quartile all year so teachers and staff would know who our low quartile students were at all times.

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

Although our numbers look better when compared to 2018, our school would still like to focus on discipline referral numbers, especially students receiving multiple D.R.'s in a school year.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains (emphasis on low quartile and emphasis on SWD and MTSS)
2. Science Achievement (through reading emphasis)
3. Discipline referral reduction
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA Reading

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading achievement and learning gains continue to be our area of importance and improvement and have over the last several years. We will also add that we expect science achievement to increase as we improve reading scores due to the reading skills it involves.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA High Standards by two percentage points (from 76% to 78%). Increase ELA Learning Gains by two points (from 63% to 65%). Increase ELA Lowest 25th Percentile by two points (from 61% to 63%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellie Spivey (spivees@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Begin implementation of the new ELA curriculum guides that have been developed over the summer for all schools. PLC's will take an active role this year in research, planning, teaching and assessment as we are dealing with possible gaps in learning due to Hurricane Michael and with COVID 19.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All of our teachers have been through extensive training in the area of reading over the last several years. Reading is the basis for all other learning so naturally becomes the focus.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Distribute low quartile ELA list to all stakeholders.
2. Careful master schedule planning for SWD and for MTSS interventions to utilize time and manpower
3. Administration to attend PLC meetings to help with any reading issues
3. Attend any ELA trainings-Teachers, administrators, staff
4. Admin will attend inservice or walk throughs related to ELA(cord of three, school walkthroughs CWT)
5. ELA liaison will attend district virtual meetings and bring back info to grade level (K-5 reps)
6. Utilize expertise of a reading coach (especially for teachers needing modeling or teachers who have questions about ELA)
7. Staff members will serve on the ELA Think Tank Summer group--Kindergarten, Third grade, Fourth grade and Fifth grade who will develop pacing guides/curriculum guides. Some will continue on with the Canvas Blueprint teams for the district.

Person Responsible Ellie Spivey (spivees@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

In studying our behavior data, we have reduced the number of discipline referrals, and we would like to continue the trend. We will reduce disruptive behavior and build a positive school climate through continued implementation of the school-wide Tier I Behavior Plan.

Measurable Outcome:

Decrease discipline referrals by 2 percent. In 2017-2018 we had 221 referrals and in 2018-2019 we had 155 (a decrease of 30%). The top discipline codes were 1. Inappropriate Behavior/Language (106) 2. Defiance/Disrespect (24) 3. Disruption Classroom (17). Top reporters were bus driver, 3rd grade and 2nd grade teacher, and Kindergarten teacher. We had 33 detentions, 29 OSS, and 23 ISS. Third grade had the highest number of referrals. We had a dramatic decrease in referrals in 2018-2019 even in a year when the mental health issues in Bay county were on the rise post Hurricane Michael. 2019-2020 data is not a full year due to COVID 19 shutting our schools down for 9 weeks. However, up to March 13, we had 99 referrals with the top categories being 1. Inappropriate behavior/language 2. Defiance/Insubordination/Non-compliance and 3. Disruption Classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michele Mathis (mathim@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- *Promise Paraprofessional and Behavior Paraprofessional in place to return students to class after brief time with them to learn how to deal with issues they are having (can utilize Merrell's Strong Kids (SEL social skills curriculum)
- *Special Area will utilize character education/character traits monthly and recognition for K-5 monthly
- *School-wide expectations in place, posted, taught and reviewed (many utilizing morning meetings also)
- *MTSS Behavior data chats
- *Special Area Behavior Team meets weekly
- *Utilize mental health resources available-Behavior Triad, PanCare, Kiosks, Community of Care referral, guidance

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We are using strategies that we have been provided and trained on through district and school staff.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Promise para and behavior para intervention
2. Special area character ed for whole school
3. Tier I implemented through entire school
4. MTSS Behavior data chats
5. Utilize Mental Health resources-Mental Health Triad, Mentors from Elevate Bay, Telehealth, guidance counselors, etc.

Person Responsible

Ellie Spivey (spivees@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

Patronis is not a Title I school.

Our school hosts several different events in order to encourage parents and teachers to join our PTO. Our very active PTO is an excellent way for all parents to become involved as it provides a multitude of flexible opportunities to volunteer. Surveys are sent out in order to determine how parents would best like to become involved. Later, the PTO board contacts parents based on their responses.

The School Volunteer Program is another way in which parents and other family members are invited to become active and involved members of our school family.

Our Fall Open House and Spaghetti Dinner later in the year are also ways we encourage our families to see what is happening in our school.

School Orientation K-5 paves the way at the beginning of each school year as students and families are welcomed to our campus.

Our School Advisory Council is made up of teachers, administrators, parents, community leaders, and business partners. Team leaders, administrators, and guests share current events and other exciting information taking place in the life of our school.

Teachers at our school encourage all of our parents to join and utilize Parent Portal.

Information regarding its access, purpose, and use are frequently included in weekly newsletters, emails, and website updates provided by teachers.

Our Media Specialist maintains the Patronis Elementary School website so that families may have access to a wide variety of resources. Links to teacher emails and class websites are readily available. The school Google Calendar is also posted on the homepage with events updated frequently.

Our PTO keeps a very active Facebook page along with our school Facebook page that is updated by staff.

Our Social Media school contact also keeps our Patronis pages up to date with useful information.

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 Reading	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00