

Gilchrist County School District

Trenton 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Trenton Elementary School

1350 SW STATE ROAD 26, Trenton, FL 32693

<https://www.gilchristschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Ronda Adkins

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)	99%
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 (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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 was approved by the Gilchrist County School Board on 11/17/2020.

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	0

Trenton Elementary School

1350 SW STATE ROAD 26, Trenton, FL 32693

<https://www.gilchristschools.org/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">24%</p>

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 Gilchrist County School Board on 11/17/2020.

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.

The mission of Trenton Elementary School is to serve each student academically, socially, and physically in an effort to encourage each to achieve his or her own maximum potential, affording him or her the opportunity to be a positive, contributing member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

'Til Everyone Succeeds

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
Adkins, Ronda	Principal	The school administrative team offers support and resources to teachers, allowing for optimal student growth. In addition to supporting classroom teachers, the administrative team ensures that all decision making is data based, MTSS interventions are observed, fidelity of interventions for students in need is proven, and adequate professional development that supports the overall process of ensuring teacher growth and student achievement is provided.
Allen, Scott	Assistant Principal	The school administrative team offers support and resources to teachers, allowing for optimal student growth. In addition to supporting classroom teachers, the administrative team ensures that all decision making is data based, MTSS interventions are observed, fidelity of interventions for students in need is proven, and adequate professional development that supports the overall process of ensuring teacher growth and student achievement is provided.
Osteen, Wendy	Assistant Principal	The school administrative team offers support and resources to teachers, allowing for optimal student growth. In addition to supporting classroom teachers, the administrative team ensures that all decision making is data based, MTSS interventions are observed, fidelity of interventions for students in need is proven, and adequate professional development that supports the overall process of ensuring teacher growth and student achievement is provided.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ronda Adkins

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.*

8

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

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)	99%
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 (72%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	135	117	103	112	128	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	687
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	5	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	33	10	14	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in Math	0	17	6	9	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	32	42	21	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	22	29	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	2	4	5	3	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	15	22	3	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/9/2020

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	131	129	126	138	112	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	15	16	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	34	44	23	11	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	2	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	18	22	8	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	4	0	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	131	129	126	138	112	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	747
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	15	16	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	3	5	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	34	44	23	11	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	2	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	18	22	8	4	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	1	4	0	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	72%	72%	57%	64%	67%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	72%	58%	65%	65%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	62%	53%	55%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	77%	63%	67%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	66%	62%	60%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	51%	48%	61%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	74%	53%	56%	55%	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	73%	70%	3%	58%	15%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	67%	-1%	58%	8%
	2018	59%	66%	-7%	56%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	75%	74%	1%	56%	19%
	2018	68%	66%	2%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	80%	6%	62%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	75%	2%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	72%	6%	64%	14%
	2018	79%	78%	1%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	81%	77%	4%	60%	21%
	2018	77%	70%	7%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	72%	-2%	53%	17%
	2018	73%	68%	5%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	47	53	50	61	64	52	37				
ELL	67	80		93	80						
BLK	40	30		65	60						
HSP	59	71		92	88						
MUL	63	82		63	64						
WHT	77	76	71	86	77	63	73				
FRL	67	74	66	79	70	57	66				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	39	56	44	36	50	35	39				
ELL	33			73							
BLK	60			67							
HSP	48	58		86	84		80				
MUL	50			62							
WHT	66	63	54	80	74	55	75				
FRL	57	59	52	75	77	60	70				

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	25	41	40	23	27	26	14				
ELL	62			69							
BLK	50	80		52	50		42				
HSP	52	69		56	50						
MUL	60			60							
WHT	66	63	54	70	61	48	61				
FRL	57	67	57	58	57	51	54				

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	66
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	23
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	69
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	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	68
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	75
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	68
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.

When looking at comparison data from 2018 to 2019, the area that showed the lowest performance was Science Achievement Level for SWD, the data went from 39% in 2018 to 37% in 2019. Teachers having less amount of time devoted to science and not using some reading opportunities to address science content.

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

When looking at comparison data from 2018 to 2019, the area of most concern is Math Learning Gains for FRL dropped 7% from 77% in 2018 to 70% in 2019. Teachers were new at using Math Discourse strategies and implementing Math Discourse during their math blocks and math remediation time. Teachers struggled with the implementation and continued to try new things.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When looking at the data components and the gap when comparing the school data to the state data, our students consistently perform at or above state average in all areas reported.

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

When looking at the data components from 2018 to 2019 that showed the most improvements; in our ELA data our ELL sub-group grew from 2018 to 2019 34% in Achievement Level. They grew from 33% to 67%. ESOL para worked with small group ELL students on improving data, and using iReady on instructional level to build skills and knowledge. In our Math data our SWD sub-group grew from 2018-2019 25% in Achievement Level. They grew from 36% to 61%. Students had extra time with math small group working with teachers and support facilitator 4 days a week.

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

When looking at the areas in the EWS data and identifying one or two areas of potential concern, are the areas where students are not performing on grade, failing coursework, number of students being retained in younger grades and students scoring below proficient on state and local assessments

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

1. Blacks ELA Data Learning Gains 30%
2. Blacks ELA Achievement Level 40%
3. SWD Science Achievement Level 37%
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Black students ELA Achievement Level was 60% in 2018 and dropped to 40% in 2019. Achievement Level among blacks dropped 20%. Teachers are meeting bi-monthly with Reading Coach, Administration and Guidance Counselors to discuss students of concerns and current data. Teachers are creating action plans and are monitored with fidelity checks and classroom walk-throughs.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of all 3rd, 4th and 5th graders will score a Level 3 or higher in ELA measured by state assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronda Adkins (adkinsr@mygcsd.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers and students are tracking and monitoring current iReady data used to monitor student's growth and performance in areas of concern. Teachers work together to learn and build lessons to support high order thinking to build ELA knowledge based on the standards. Support Facilitation will work with students to support areas of concern and offer small group instruction. Teachers will use MTSS small group time to work with students that are struggling on specific standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on Hattie's research affect size of 1.44, students who monitor and report self grades and performance have reasonably accurate understanding of their levels of achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and students will track and monitoring current iReady data used to monitor student's growth and performance in areas of concern. Teachers will set goals with students and monitor weekly for growth. Students will work with Support Facilitation in small group setting to work on areas of weakness. Teachers will pull students during MTSS time to focus on standards of concern.

Person Responsible Ronda Adkins (adkinsr@mygcsd.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD Science Achievement Level was at 37% in 2019. In 2017 SWD Science Achievement was at 14% and grew to 39% in 2018.

Measurable Outcome: 75% of all students will perform at a Level 3 or higher at in Science FCAT measured by State Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronda Adkins (adkinsr@mygcsd.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Based on Hatti's research, teachers having data talks with students on areas of concern has a high affect size. Teachers and students are having data talks and monitoring current data used to monitor student's growth and performance in areas of concern using current weekly science data which is used to monitor student's growth and performance and mid-year science standard-based assessments will be monitored for cumulative knowledge performance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on Hatti's research, teachers having data talks with students on areas of concern has a high affect size. I

Action Steps to Implement

Fifth grade teachers will meet with fifth grade students on current weekly science assessment and set goals for each student based on their weekly test. They will use science standard-based assessments to monitor for cumulative knowledge performance.

Person Responsible Ronda Adkins (adkinsr@mygcsd.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: When looking at comparison data from 2018-2019, the area of most concern is Math Learning Gains for FRL dropped 7% from 77% in 2018 to 70% in 2019.

Measurable Outcome: 85% of all 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students will score Level 3 or higher on the state achievement test.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use professional learning communities with other professionals to build lessons to help struggling students and the students will receive extra small group time with support facilitation to help students struggling in the area of Math. Students will work with the teacher during MTSS time using Math Discourse, along with other strategies to build knowledge. Students work daily with iReady to focus on their individual learning path and teachers monitor performance on individual lessons to help students continually gain skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers work together to learn and build lessons to support high order thinking and hands-on activities with manipulatives to build Math knowledge based on the standards. Support Facilitation will work with students to support areas of concern and offer small group instruction. Teachers will use MTSS small group time to work with students that are struggling on specific standards. Students work on iReady daily to build knowledge and fill in gaps in math .

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Writing English Language Arts
 In 2019, 10% of students in 4th and 5th grade scored an 8, 9 or 10 on writing

Measurable Outcome: 30% or higher of all 4th and 5th graders will score 8, 9, or 10 points on essay writing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronda Adkins (adkinsr@mygcsd.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher will use strategies and writing lessons from Core Connections to support the implementation of the ELA Writing Standards and they will monitor students' performance with unit based assignments and Gilchrist Reads & Writes Progress Monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will receive more guidance and Professional Learning with Core Connections and will use professional learning communities with grade level teachers and reading coach to grade and collaborate on Gilchrist Reads & Writes. This will allow for more of a focus to be on their Writing lessons and classroom and district assessments to improve students' essay writing scores.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

When looking at the sub-group; Blacks ELA Data, teachers will create a tracking document for students to monitor their current class data on their performance on iReady. SWD Sub-group in Science will have data talks with teachers using current data and set individual goals for increase performance level in Science.

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.

Community stakeholders play a very important role in our school's culture. Our school is always looking for ways to involve and sustain the connection of our stakeholders' and a quality school environment. This school year, it is more important than ever that everyone feels a part of our community school and our TES family. Trenton Elementary schedules parent conference nights to involve families in their child's education and learning. We also have a phone home system that informs our parents every Sunday of the upcoming week's activities and events. Our school has set up parents of the spelling bee contestants virtually where they are able to view and enjoy the school's spelling bee by logging into Microsoft Teams to watch their child compete in the school spelling bee. Teachers have created communication platforms for parents to receive photos and messages about their child's class. Parents are able to connect virtually with our guidance department and teachers through Microsoft Teams and make educational decisions based on their child's individual needs.

We at Trenton Elementary are frequently looking for ways to involve all stakeholders in our school and persistently seeking success.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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