

Putnam County School District

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

Demographics

Principal: Paula Adams

Start Date for this Principal: 10/8/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr Elementary School

251 S STATE ROAD 315, Interlachen, FL 32148

www.putnamschools.org/o/ies

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	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	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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 at Interlachen Elementary School is to provide engaging and effective standards-based instruction that will allow students to reach academic proficiency. Through collective responsibility, our students will grow and learn in a positive environment where all students, faculty, staff, parents and community members work together to foster successful outcomes.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Interlachen Elementary School is dedicated to achieving our school mission through educating our students by staying focused on learning, creating a collaborative culture and monitoring the results of student growth to inform and improve best practices for success.

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
Haengel, Ted	Principal	Oversees the safety and every day function of the school with a specific focus on academic procedures and implementation as well as the conditions of the school. Observes classroom teachers and offers feedback for instructional deficiencies.
Redman, Valerie Lynn	Instructional Coach	Leading and supporting classroom teachers with instructional materials, strategies and data analysis . She also leads the MTSS process by working with classroom teachers and parents to provide interventions for struggling students. Takes part in the School Based Threat Assessment Team meetings monthly.
Farrar, Susan	School Counselor	Oversees ESOL students and administers the WIDA screener. Provides individual and/or small group interventions for students with mental wellness needs. Oversees 504 plans and meetings with parents. Takes part in the School Based Threat Assessment Team meetings monthly. Administers CogAt testing to potential Cambridge students. Oversees the CogAt for all 1st graders. Oversees, organizes and trains teachers in the administration of state testing and schedules all state tests for general education students and FSAA students.
Baggs, Kim	Assistant Principal	Responsible for overseeing school safety and security measures are in place. Completes the FSSAT. Completes the PFIP. Oversees training for classroom teachers and paras. Observes classroom teachers giving instructional feedback through iObservation. Coaching for teachers and paras. Collaborates and oversees Dean with school discipline, PBIS, School Based Threat Assessment Team, and parent meetings. Works with the school-based Principal on any other items deemed necessary for the growth and development of teachers, students and other staff members and contributes to student achievement.
Morris, Maeghan	Dean	Oversees school climate through PBIS monitoring and processing of discipline data. Leads the School Based Threat Assessment Team. Creates and maintains student safety plans and educates classroom teachers on their status. Collects and monitors classroom behavior support plans. Ensures faculty and staff are properly educated on the completion of BIP and student referrals. Maintains positive parent communication throughout the behavior intervention and referral process. Helps support teachers with classroom behavior interventions. Monitors school-wide behavior patterns and trends to promote a positive school climate. Creates and monitors attendance awards for students, schedules monthly and semester behavior incentives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/8/2018, Paula Adams

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	102	113	116	119	116	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	673
Attendance below 90 percent	60	32	47	28	35	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	5	7	11	7	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	39	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	2	8	6	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	120	113	128	131	117	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	22	38	40	43	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	2	4	9	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	4	4	8	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	6	6	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	120	113	128	131	117	131	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	740
Attendance below 90 percent	22	38	40	43	37	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	214
One or more suspensions	2	4	9	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	46	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	4	4	8	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	6	6	14	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	44%	46%	57%	47%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	58%	53%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	54%	53%	53%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	51%	63%	56%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	64%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	51%	53%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	41%	53%	45%	37%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	36%	41%	-5%	58%	-22%
	2018	36%	40%	-4%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	43%	3%	58%	-12%
	2018	39%	38%	1%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	44%	42%	2%	56%	-12%
	2018	39%	39%	0%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	46%	-3%	62%	-19%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	53%	1%	64%	-10%
	2018	49%	50%	-1%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	43%	44%	-1%	60%	-17%
	2018	46%	48%	-2%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	38%	6%	53%	-9%
	2018	51%	42%	9%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	19	50	50	24	51	45	21				
ELL	38			56	70						
BLK	25			40							
HSP	48	63	67	53	63		30				
MUL	42	32		50	55		40				
WHT	44	52	51	47	57	40	49				
FRL	41	50	51	43	53	43	38				
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	36	27	30	37	25	27				
ELL	10			36							
BLK	42	60		42	50						
HSP	31	44	38	36	45	21	21				

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
MUL	35	27		39	50						
WHT	43	42	33	50	47	46	57				
FRL	36	39	27	43	45	36	54				
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	26	23	26	44	29	21				
BLK	32	42		42	50						
HSP	45	53	70	50	52	36	29				
MUL	46	53		48	56						
WHT	48	54	51	59	67	57	46				
FRL	42	51	48	51	62	52	46				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	62
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	
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	33
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	44
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	49
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	51
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.

ELA, Math and Science Achievement in SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance. As well as Math Lowest 25th percentile school-wide, 3rd grade ELA, and ELA achievement in our Black subgroup. Contributing factors include students needing more individualized attention as they were in the MTSS process, high referral rates, an increase in students with one or more suspensions, continuous goal setting and monitoring student achievement for standards mastery by using district assessments, and setting high expectations.

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

The Science achievement data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year. This decline was substantial. Contributing factors include a large number of students in the MTSS process, an increase in out of school suspensions, and a higher number of SWD who need additional services.

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 with the largest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement. Contributing factors include a high number of SWD and student in the MTSS process needing additional support. Low math scores have been a trend for the school and most subgroups are affected.

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

The components showing the most improvement were ELA lowest 25th percentile and 4th grade ELA. More intensive and individualized interventions and progress monitoring by the teacher have contributed to growth.

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

Potential area of concern is the number of student referrals and out of school suspensions for both general education students and Students with Disabilities.

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

1. Increased proficiency of the SWD Subgroup in ELA, Math and Science
2. Third and 4th grade ELA and Math Proficiency
3. Increase 5th Grade Science Proficiency
4. Decrease the number of referrals and out of school suspensions (includes SWD)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will be more inclusive in their instructional practices when teaching ELA and Math in order to specifically target our SWD subgroup and increase proficiency and learning gains because this was the lowest performing component of our school subgroup data.
Measurable Outcome:	5th grade Students with Disabilities will make a 5% increase in ELA and Math growth and proficiency on state assessments as compared to previous year assessments. 65% of 3rd, 4th and 5th grade SWD will score at a level 2 or higher on state assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ted Haengel (thaengel@my.putnamschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students needing additional services will be taught using the Wilson Reading System and Singapore Math Program. Students will also complete the number of Mindplay minutes as stated on their IEPs. These students will receive additional monitoring and support tailored to their needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Additional support and monitoring is needed to ensure that students receive appropriate interventions to increase student learning.
Action Steps to Implement	
Scheduling of Pull out/Push in support from ESE teachers for additional Interventions. Lesson plans specifically targeted for SWD.	
Person Responsible	Kim Baggs (kbaggs@my.putnamschools.org)
Mindplay will be used to fill gaps in ELA deficits. Moby Max will be used to fill in Math deficits.	
Person Responsible	Ted Haengel (thaengel@my.putnamschools.org)
Snap and Read and Co-Writer Programs will be used to support ELA comprehension.	
Person Responsible	Valerie Lynn Redman (vredman@my.putnamschools.org)
Subgroup data for students with disabilities will be progress monitored and the level of support adjusted as needed. Teachers will monitor this ESE subgroup data in PLCs.	
Person Responsible	Ted Haengel (thaengel@my.putnamschools.org)
The Wilson Reading Curriculum will be used to support ELA. Singapore Math will support math interventions.	
Person Responsible	Kim Baggs (kbaggs@my.putnamschools.org)
School-wide referral and out of school suspension data will be monitored for students with disabilities and behavior interventions put in place or behavior plans created based on the need of the student.	
Person Responsible	Maeghan Morris (mmorris@my.putnamschools.org)

Students with disabilities needing SEL during school hours will receive support services. This will be monitored through MTSS and Guidance.

Person Responsible Susan Farrar (sfarrar@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

By addressing our ESSA subgroup, SWD, we will encompass addressing the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities. The areas of referrals, out-of-school suspensions, low ELA, Math and Science achievement will improve just by focusing on this large subgroup. Also, students in the MTSS process will benefit from additional strategies used by teachers to reach the SWD subgroup. Finally, working with the improvement of this subgroup addresses other race subgroups for improvement.

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.

The school works in collaboration with the PTO/SAC, PBS committee and Kona Ice to promote positive behavior incentives and rewards. The school has set school-wide expectations, created a school pledge, uses positive support when addressing student behaviors and is more closely monitoring student behavior patterns in the classroom before they escalate to the point of a referral. Teachers have had training for better parent communication before a referral has been reached and how to be more inclusive with their teaching practices. Teachers have also been trained to use the Collaborative Classroom Caring Schools Community Curriculum to address SEL goals.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.