Moore Haven Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Moore Haven Elementary School

401 TERRIER PRIDE DR SW, Moore Haven, FL 33471

www.gladesedu.org

Demographics

Principal: Kristi Durance

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	86%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Glades 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

Moore Haven Elementary School

401 TERRIER PRIDE DR SW, Moore Haven, FL 33471

www.gladesedu.org

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	99%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Glades 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.

It is the mission of Moore Haven Elementary School to create life-long learners by providing a quality education in a safe environment of trust understanding and respect.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Striving to be Florida's premier learning organization.

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
Brickel, Jim	Principal	The leadership team is the core of all decision making for the school. All members participate and are a vital part of making it to the end goals. The principal and assistant principal lead the discussion and provide guidance to meeting school goals. The reading intervention teachers collaborate with teachers to provide direction and resources to meet the student and teacher needs that are present. The teachers on the leadership team are the leaders for their grade level. They work daily with the teachers in their grade level to disseminate information from the district and school administration. They also serve as a voice for all teachers with the entire leadership team.
Pryor, Leslie	Assistant Principal	
Lowman, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Garrett, Stefanie	Teacher, K-12	
Palladino, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Croskey, Christie	Teacher, K-12	
Beck, Emma Ruth	Teacher, K-12	
Woodward, Reba	Teacher, K-12	
Humphries, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	
Spivey, Veronica	Teacher, PreK	
Prowant, Susan	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kristi Durance

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

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)	86%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	59	59	48	65	48	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	329
Attendance below 90 percent	11	8	4	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	10	6	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	1	4	5	2	2	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	0	
	0	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	1	2	2	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	62	68	51	61	68	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	17	9	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	4	8	3	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	2	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	4	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	62	68	51	61	68	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	17	9	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	4	8	3	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	3	2	1	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	4	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	51%	59%	57%	40%	46%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	48%	58%	40%	39%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	42%	53%	25%	24%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	53%	66%	63%	58%	65%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	56%	62%	69%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	43%	51%	64%	63%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	46%	53%	34%	40%	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	50%	62%	-12%	58%	-8%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	49%	1%	58%	-8%
	2018	44%	57%	-13%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	-1%					
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
	2018	42%	38%	4%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison	6%					
Cohort Comparison	4%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	69%	-21%	62%	-14%
	2018	62%	67%	-5%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison	-14%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	53%	3%	64%	-8%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison	4%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					
05	2019	52%	52%	0%	60%	-8%
	2018	47%	42%	5%	61%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	47%	-8%	53%	-14%
	2018	31%	35%	-4%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	44	45		31	40						
ELL	42			58							
BLK	33	26		33	37		20				
HSP	55	62	50	54	50	33	42				
WHT	55	51	54	66	55	42	52				
FRL	42	45	38	46	40	38	31				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	39		31	40		19				
ELL	18			45							
BLK	20	44		35	29						
HSP	42	51	54	54	45	36	22				
WHT	58	56	60	65	49	40	48				
FRL	43	49	50	56	41	24	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	31	19	7	42	41	40	19				
ELL	20	40		55	60						
BLK	38	36		42	57						
HSP	32	36	22	62	70	56	29				
WHT	47	48		62	72		40				
FRL	37	41	29	51	69	65	25				

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	25
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	348
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	42
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	
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 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	54
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Our 5th Grade Science scores failed to reach our expectations. Although they rose 11% points in 2019, this likely amounts to 2 students, and we still failed to reach the district or state average for proficiency.

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

Our learning gains for the lowest quartile in both ELA and Mathematics suffered greatly from 2018-2019.

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.

Our 5th grade Science scores were 14 points below the state average.

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

Although Science Achievement improved 11 points, the scores were still below the district and state averages.

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

Student attendance is a concern
Student achievement is a concern

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

1. Increasing Student Achievement
2. Increasing Student attendance
3. Helping Teachers to become Highly Qualified, and prepared to teach the BEST Standards
4. Develop a written MTSS Plan
5. Develop a written PBIS Plan

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Center for Educational Leadership (CEL), out of the University of Washington, identified 5 major dimensions of effective teaching. Based on classroom walk throughs and discussions at Grade Level Meetings (aka. PLCs), the first dimension- identifying, articulating and measuring the purpose of the lesson- is coming along nicely at the school. The school is ready to focus on the second dimension, which is Student Engagement
Measurable Outcome:	Engagement strategies (Student Talk, Student Responses to Teacher Questioning) will encourage equitable and purposeful student participation and ensure that all students have access to, and are expected to participate in, learning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1) Kagan Training, which was delivered to all teachers during pre-week, will encourage equitable student talk 2) Student Response Cards, or individual white boards, will encourage all students to answer quaetions in class, rather than just one selected student. 3) Popsicle Stick Names will allow the teacher to call upon students randomly, based on the name on the popsicle stick that he or she draws from a cup, rather than the student who is raining his/her hand, encouraging all students to participate in the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1) After walking through many classrooms, at many schools throughout Florida, we are convinced that Kagan sets the standard for excellence in equitable student talk. The structures that are set in place allow all students in a group to actively and equitably participate in a small-group lesson, so one student does not dominate while the others 'tag along'. 2) Response cards and white boards allow every student to answer the question that the teacher poses to the class, rather than one student. Students who had been able to daydream in class, knowing that the student who raises his or her in class will cover for them, must now participate in the lesson, and prove that he or she has mastered their learning. 3) Popsicle Stick Names allows the teacher to truly randomize the student they call upon. Students will pay attention to the lesson and the teacher's questions, because they cannot count on certain students in the class to answer the questions for them.

Action Steps to Implement

The School Leadership Team will train the staff on these engagement stategies in trainings, faculty meetings and grade level PLCs.

Person Responsible Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

Walk throughs, formal and informal observations, and discussions during PLCs will monitor the implementation of the engagement strategies that have been introduced

Person Responsible Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

Individual conversations with teachers, praising their accomplishments and identifying 'next steps', will encourage teachers to grow in the their learning and implementation of the strategies.

Person Responsible Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

Final evaluations will identify teachers who need additional support in implementing engagement strategies, and allow for a plan to help with that implementation

Person Responsible
Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	MHES will use the Glades Truancy Plan to work with students and families who are exhibiting poor attendance prractices
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the 'Early Warning System' for attendance will decrease 50%, from 42 students to 21 students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lesle Hare (lesle.hare@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Glades Truancy Program adheres to state law, allowing the school and the school district to meet with parents, and discuss the importance of school attendance while working to break down the roadblocks to good school attendance develop positive habits.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Glades Truancy Program has been reviewed by the Department of Juvenile Justice and found to be a quality plan. if used with fidelity, we should be able to tackle our truancy issues.

Action Steps to Implement

Our 'Skylert' system will automatically call the family of any student that is absent from school

Person Responsible	Lesle Hare (lesle.hare@glades-schools.org)

Work with the school district to ensure our 'Skyward' MIS program alerts our Guidance Counselor whenever a student is exhibiting poor attendance, as defined by state statute. When the alert arrives, the Guidance Counselor will use the approved form letter, on school stationary, to alert the family as to the attendance issues, and give the family the opportunity to address the absences with school administration.

Person Responsible	Lesle Hare (lesle.hare@glades-schools.org)

If the attendance issues continue, the school will call for an 'Early Warning' meeting with the student's family, to develop strategies to address this EWS Indicator, as well as any other indicators the child may be exhibiting

Person Responsible	Lesle Hare (lesle.hare@glades-schools.org)

If the attendance issues continue following the first meeting, the school will call for a second 'Early Warning' meeting with the student's family, to develop strategies to address this EWS Indicator, as well as any other indicators the child may be exhibiting. The school will invite the Director of Administrative Services, who oversees truancy for the school district, as well as a representative of Lutheran Services, who works with truancy through the Department of Juvenile Justice, to this meeting

Person Responsible	Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

If truancy issues continue after the second meeting, the school or the school district will complete a "Child in Need of Services or Family in Need of Services" petition with Lutheran Services. If Lutheran Services will not service the child (they do not service children under 10 years of age), the school will recommend that the superintendent file a Truancy Petition with the Clerk of Courts at the Glades County Courthouse.

Person Responsible	Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Develop a written PBIS plan for the school
Measurable Outcome:	Moore Haven Elementary School will apply for and receive 'Bronze Level' status for our school with the PBIS Project out of the University of South Florida.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Moore Haven Elementary School has been working with the PBIS Project since 2015 to work on analyzing our school discipline data, and develop solutions to minimize common incidents that are occurring in our classrooms and school. Developing a written plan will allow all stakeholders in the school to understand our rationale and process, and allow for continuity in the plan.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The PBIS Project is a well established, well respected program that is funded through a grant to the University of South Florida. Countless schools throughout the nation use PBIS to improve the culture and climate of their schools.

Action Steps to Implement

The school's PBIS Team will work with model school plans provided by the PBIS Project to develop a draft copy of our school level plan

Person Responsible Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

The team will discuss the draft plan with the School Advisory Council, the PBIS Project and the grade levels during PLCs. The team will take notes as to possible revisions that could be made to improve the plan

Person Responsible Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

Once a consensus is reached with all stakeholders, the plan will be published, and advertised on our school district website.

Person Responsible Jim Brickel (james.brickel@glades-schools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1) MHES will study the state testing information provided by FLDOE, and look over our student data twice/month in PLCs, to ensure that our students are prepared for the state tests.
3) MHES will work individually with teachers who are not Highly Qualified, providing them the support and encouragement they need to become Highly Qualified
4) The MTSS team will work with the school district to develop a written MTSS plan that explains the process for all of our stakeholders.

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.

Positive Culture is a major part of our school's Mission Statement:
"...in a safe environment of trust understanding and respect."
This mission statement, along with the MHES Pledge, is sent to the students daily in our announcements, and posted all around the school.

The school principal 'fist bumps' every student he comes in to contact with during the school day (high fives have been discontinued because of Covid), and encourages the staff to show the same love and enthusiasm through his daily interactions with them, as well as during PLCs and Faculty Meetings.

The school is developing a written PBIS Plan, and hopes to be a 'Bronze Level' school this year.

The staff is trained in Restorative Circles, and their use is encouraged.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				$8,419.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0051 - Moore Haven Elementary School	Title II		$6,000.00
			Notes: Day 1 and 2 of Kagan Training			
	6400	510-Supplies	0051 - Moore Haven Elementary School	Title II		$2,419.00
			Notes: Materials and Supplies to Implement Kagan Structures in the School			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$8,419.00**