Niblack Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Niblack Elementary School

837 NE BROADWAY AVE, Lake City, FL 32055

http://nes.columbiak12.com/

Demographics

Principal: Kaeutonia Murphy

Start Date for this Principal: 9/30/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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 Columbia 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

Niblack Elementary School

837 NE BROADWAY AVE, Lake City, FL 32055

http://nes.columbiak12.com/

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	96%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Columbia 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 at Niblack Elementary School is to provide a learning experience that will allow our students to excel in all areas of life. We aim for an atmosphere of cooperation, with respect for individual differences that is conducive to success. We strive for active engagement from our parents, teachers, staff and community members.

The school's mission and vision statement is communicated with parents through monthly newsletters, the website, and also it is shared at the Open House visit for the school year. This information is posted in every classroom, as well as in the front office.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Niblack Elementary School, we are committed to the academic, physical and social development of our students.

We are a community school that strives to create a union among staff, students, parents, community members, and business partners that will ensure quality education for the students we serve.

We expect all of our students to achieve and maintain high educational standards.

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
Ivery, Nakitha	Principal	
Bicknell, Terri	School Counselor	
Symonette, Violet	Instructional Coach	
James, Nancy	Other	
Sanders, Tracy	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/30/2020, Kaeutonia Murphy

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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	61	42	39	35	42	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
Attendance below 90 percent	31	15	7	7	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	4	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	3	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	11	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	3	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/30/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	13	16	10	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	8	8	8	9	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	16	9	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	7	12	11	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	15	13	16	10	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	8	8	8	9	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	16	9	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	7	12	11	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	60%	57%	34%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	60%	58%	50%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	67%	53%	59%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	66%	63%	63%	68%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	61%	62%	65%	66%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	51%	69%	62%	51%
Science Achievement	28%	55%	53%	41%	58%	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	33%	68%	-35%	58%	-25%
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison	-6%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	62%	-21%	58%	-17%
	2018	26%	56%	-30%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison	15%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					
05	2019	29%	59%	-30%	56%	-27%
	2018	39%	53%	-14%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison	3%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	44%	70%	-26%	62%	-18%
	2018	58%	66%	-8%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	64%	-2%	64%	-2%
	2018	50%	67%	-17%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	12%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					
05	2019	35%	65%	-30%	60%	-25%
	2018	68%	68%	0%	61%	7%
Same Grade Comparison	-33%					
Cohort Comparison	-15%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	23%	59%	-36%	53%	-30%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	59%	-24%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
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	35	43		39	57		33				
BLK	32	45	57	49	57	47	21				
FRL	34	43	56	47	59	43	26				
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	37	44		37	31						
BLK	36	39	47	60	58	56	31				
FRL	36	41	50	59	57	59	27				
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	14	38		47	57						
BLK	33	49	57	62	64	75	36				
FRL	33	51	59	62	63	73	39				

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	47
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	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	44
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
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.

For the 2019 grade component that showed the lowest component was Science Achievement. The Science achievement level was 28 percent. Also the ELA achievement level is an area of concern. The ELA achievement level was 39 percent. ELA and Science have been the lower achievement areas in previous years. In the subgroup category our black students are the lowest performing. In the area of ELA black students achievement was 21%. A few contributing factors include: new teachers in each grade level, students have limited vocabulary and language barriers, and iReady practice and lessons allow students to work at their own pace.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was Math Achievement. Math achievement was 60 percent from the year 2018, but in 2019 the achievement level dropped to 51 percent. In 2018 Math bottom quartile was 59 percent and in 2019 it dropped to 47 percent. In the subgroup category our black students showed the greatest decline in the area of Math achievement. Decreasing from 60% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. A few factors that contributed to this decline include: increased behavior issues, attendance issues, lack of effective strategies to teach and reach low performing students and instructional needs.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science Achievement. The state's average was 53% and our school was 28%. Science correlates with reading and students must be able to decode, comprehend and analyze the information given to them to formulate correct test responses, all within a specified period of time. In the areas of ELA and Math

fifth grade also had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. In ELA, fifth grade was 27% below the state and Math fifth grade was 25% below the state average. Our students lack background knowledge and the ability to inference text. Understanding the text better would help them draw information from their existing knowledge and relate more to the text and questions.

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 the ELA Achievement Gains in the bottom quartile. In 2018 the bottom quartile was 50 percent in achievement gains. In 2019, the bottom quartile was 56 percent in achievement gains. We implemented intervention group with the lowest quartile students. These students received 40 minutes of intervention in reading twice a week. Support staff pushed into the classes during reading times to help provide small group differentiated instruction based on student's needs. Tutors were also used to work with our bubble students in the area of ELA. Tutors used the FOCUS materials to work with our bubble students on their identified benchmarks from the iReady program. Weekly classroom walkthroughs with feedback and suggestions from the lead team aided teachers in improving direct instruction. The BRT, CRT, and IC all assisted teachers in the areas that were noted from the walkthroughs. The lead team used a tiered intervention plan with teachers to strategically implement assistance where needed. We also used information gathered from walkthroughs and surveys from teachers to provide professional learning opportunities. Professional learning topics included student engagement, rigor, unpacking the standards/item specifications, collaboration, embedded writing, AR and iReady.

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

From the EWS data, potential areas of concerns are the percentage of students scoring Level 1 on statewide and course failure in ELA/Math. Currently Niblack Elementary does not have any migrant students. In the event that we were to receive any migrant students, we would address their needs through the MTSS process.

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

1. Increase ELA achievement
2. Increase Science achievement
3. Modify behavior and individual plans
4. Increase parental support
5. Improve attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Student Achievement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing the 2019 FSA scores the overall areas of focus are ELA, Math, and Science. The proficiency for the ELA and Science was 39 and 28 percent. The percent of our student achieving proficiency is below the state average in ELA by 18 percent and 25 percent in Science. The Math score decreased by 9 percent so this is a focus area for the school as well. With the low proficiency rate in ELA and Science and the decrease in Math scores from the previous year, the focus for the school year will be on the tested subject areas.
Measurable Outcome:	If all teachers provide high quality rigorous instruction aligned with subject area standards, then student achievement will increase by 3% in ELA, Math, and Science through differentiated instruction by implementing technology through the web based software and supplemental educational materials and supplies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nakitha Ivery (iveryn@columbiak12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction (small group), guided instruction, explicit and systematic phonics instruction, and intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies above were utilized with our bottom quartile performing students in 2018. This group showed the highest improvement. Students received small group differentiated instruction weekly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will partake in individualized instruction through Accelerated Reader, iReady ELA and Math, and Study Island.
2. Teachers will incorporate the use of technology in the classrooms via chromebooks, laptops, and projectors.
3. Teachers will utilize supplemental materials, LAFS, MAFS, Focus, Zoom In, Scholastic News, and Read Works to meet students individual needs.
4. Students will receive individualized instruction from paraprofessional and tutors to work in small groups with students on targeted benchmarks.
5. Teachers will be provided with professional learning opportunities in all focus areas. Principal, Instructional Coach, CRT, and BRT will facilitate these professional opportunities to teachers.

Person Responsible	Violet Symonette (symonettev@columbiak12.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After analyzing the 2018-2019 parent involvement activities, the results showed poor parental/family involvement. Studies have shown that students who have some type of support system achieve better.
Measurable Outcome:	If we increase family involvement at Niblack through providing opportunities for active engagement then student achievement will increase by 3% and discipline referrals will decreased 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Science night, cold read night, math night, parent conferences, and compacts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After analyzing the data, the results show that families that attended these events have children who are more susscessful.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Curriculum nights (ELA, Math, Science) - We will provide families grade appropriate information in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. Students and parents will have opportunities to visit stations and engage in hands-on activities. Parents will receive innovative ways to make learning enjoyable.
2. Family Reading Nights - We will provide families with academic knowledge using interesting, fun activities in core academics and technology.
3. Step up Nights - We will provide families with information about grade level expectations for the next grade.
4. SAC meetings - We will provide families and community members with information about initiatives to improve student achievement. We also allow them the opportunity to give input.
5. Parent/family conferences - We will provide families the opportunity to meet their child's teacher and ask about their progress and receive strategies from home practice.

Person Responsible	Nancy James (jamesn@columbiak12.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 will address other schoolwide priorities through discussions in weekly leadership meetings. Also, leadership team members meet weekly with each grade level during their planning period for common planning. During these meetings we address MTSS, attendance, discipline, data/academics, social and emotional concerns of students. We look at different subgroups of students and their performance. If we had any migrant students, we would discuss their progress as well during these meetings.

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.

Niblack Elementary builds a positive culture that is parent and family friendly by the use of positive communications, meaningful parent engagement activities, and parent conferences. We use newsletters, school messenger, social media, and welcome all visitors to build positive relationships with parents, family, and other community stakeholders. We help parents see the importance of education for their child.

Niblack offers opportunities for stakeholders to be included in the Title I Schoolwide Plan and the Parent and Family Engagement Plan by using School Advisory Council meeting for public input. Surveys are also utilized to solicit parent input. We also provide numerous opportunities for parents to attend events involving their students. These include but are not limited to, open house, meet the teacher, science night, reading nights, math nights, family fun nights, royal court, and cold read academy.

Our mission at Niblack Elementary School is to provide a learning experience that will allow our students to excel in all areas of life. We aim for an atmosphere of cooperation, with respect for individual differences that is conducive to success. We strive for active engagement from our parents, teachers, staff and community members.

The school's mission and vision statement is communicated with parents through monthly newsletters, the website, and also it is shared at the Open House visit for the school year. This information is posted in every classroom, as well as in the front office.

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: Other: Student Achievement				$19,211.16
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title V, Part B		$2,812.38
			Notes: Accelerated Reader			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title V, Part B		$487.34

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			Notes: Study Island			
	5100	310-Professional and Technical Services	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title II		$10,173.00
			Notes: Kagan Professional Development			
	5100	310-Professional and Technical Services	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title II		$791.00
			Notes: Data Days			
	5100	510-Supplies	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$4,347.44
			Notes: Materials and Supplies			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$600.00
			Notes: Technology Related-Materials and supplies			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement**				**$2,699.40**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6150	510-Supplies	0161 - Niblack Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,699.40
					Total:	**$21,910.56**