St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace

2010 W 12TH ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Ostrenga

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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)	Alternative 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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 Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

St. Andrew School At Oakland Terrace

2010 W 12TH ST, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	%

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

School Grades History

Year	**2011-12**	**2011-12**
Grade		

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of St. Andrew School, in participation with our families and the community, is committed to providing a safe learning environment that promotes each child's social/emotional and academic development through positive behavioral supports and research-based practices. All students are provided opportunities to develop and achieve according to their own strengths in preparation for integration into the least restrictive educational and social setting.

Provide the school's vision statement.

St. Andrew will provide a standard of excellence and positive supports in a safe environment where all students can achieve their full potential in academic, behavioral, and character development.

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
Branstetter, Janie	Principal	The Principal is the school leader, overseeing all facets of the institution. The Principal's role is to lead staff in the implementation of instructional practices, provide formal and informal feedback to staff, manage the operations of the facility and daily activities of the school, and to be the voice of the school in public,
Chace, Sara	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Chace is the 2nd grade team leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.
Cummings, Kristin	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Cummings is our Title I Coordinator. She manages the Title I paperwork, assists in planning Title I parent events, documents Title I activities, attends Title I meetings, and assists Administration with any and all Title I processes.
Hair, Cassandra	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Hair is the 3rd grade team leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.
Rockhill, Marsha	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Rockhill serves on the School Improvement Team. She assists with the development of the school improvement plan and attends School Advisory Council Meetings. Mrs. Rockhill is the music/art teacher and sees all the students in the school, providing a different viewpoint.
Willis-Mathis, Karen	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Mathis is the prek, K, 1 Team Leader. She shares information from the leadership team with her colleagues and brings information back to Administration from her team.
May, Sandra	Instructional Media	Ms. May is the Media Specialist and a member of the School Improvement Team. She sees all students providing a different viewpoint.
Parrish, Jackie	School Counselor	Mrs. Parrish serves on the leadership team as the School Guidance Counselor.
Breland, Debbie	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Breland is a 3rd grade teacher that is serving on the School Improvement Team this year.
Balentine, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	Supports the Principal in all decision making areas with an emphasis on school-wide discipline, safety, and facilitates management.
Jateff, Valerie	Teacher, ESE	Serves as the Team Lead for 4th Grade

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Thoma, Leslie	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Thoma is the 5th grade team leader. She shares information with her team members and brings back information to Administration.
Bassett, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Bassett is our Intervention Teacher responsible for managing our crisis intervention team. He oversees the crisis intervention program, maintains the official data base for monitoring daily crisis events.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Kathryn Ostrenga

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.*
1

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

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)	Alternative 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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade

	2017-18: No Grade
	2016-17: No Grade
	2015-16: No Grade

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	17	8	18	15	22	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Attendance below 90 percent	10	5	4	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	10	3	10	8	13	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	9	4	3	4	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/10/2020

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	4	18	12	15	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Attendance below 90 percent	3	12	8	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	7	5	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	10	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	6	4	2	6	7	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	2	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	4	18	12	15	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Attendance below 90 percent	3	12	8	5	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	7	5	5	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	10	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	6	4	2	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	0%	55%	57%	0%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	59%	58%	0%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	53%	0%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	56%	63%	0%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	54%	62%	0%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	51%	0%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	53%	53%	0%	44%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	57%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	25%	58%	-33%	58%	-33%
	2018	11%	51%	-40%	56%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2019	4%	56%	-52%	56%	-52%
	2018	3%	50%	-47%	55%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	62%	-16%	62%	-16%
	2018	48%	63%	-15%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
	2018	31%	59%	-28%	62%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	4%	54%	-50%	60%	-56%
	2018	13%	57%	-44%	61%	-48%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	8%	54%	-46%	53%	-45%
	2018	10%	54%	-44%	55%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	20	17		27	26		10				
BLK	20	9		14	18						
WHT	25	33		40	40						
FRL	17	19		28	28		6				
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	100
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	15
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	
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 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	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	20
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

All subgroups are low and tested well below the 41% benchmark. 5th grade ELA and the subgroup would be African American.

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

4th grade ELA. 4 days in a row of testing that included a Monday. Under utilization of accommodations. The trend appears to be as students move up in grades their stamina and performance declines.

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.

5th grade math at 56% difference. 4 days in a row of testing that included a Monday. Under utilization of accommodations. The trend appears to be as students move up in grades their stamina and performance declines. Only exposed to math curriculum for under 3 years.

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

4th grade math. Teachers work together to plan. Focus pacing schedules based upon standards that had not been covered due to Hurricane.

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

Attendance/Level 1 performance/course failures.

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

1. Behavioral Strategies- Continuing new system for calling assistance to classroom, positive referrals, trauma sensitive classrooms, Continuing Emotional Poverty Book Study, and a new student data tracking system.
2. Intensive focus on daily reading instruction utilizing an explicit direct instruction program along with standards based instruction on grade level content. Classroom teacher deliberate practice focuses on making reading gains for all student.
3. Maximizing the state testing schedule and students' accommodations.
4. Attendance incentives- weekly attendance buck, monthly attendance parties, awards assemblies, monitoring attendance, student data tracking system.
5. Managing mental health services- CAC provider, Florida Therapy provider, New Mental Health Triad services, telemedicine, support positions, community care referral process, threat assessment team.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	State and District assessment data is well below State and District proficiency rates. Learning gains fell significantly in all 3 assessed grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of St. Andrew School students will make learning gains based upon State/District assessment results for both ELA and Math. This outcome was selected because 50% learning gains would reach the Commendable School Improvement rating. We were only 21% learning gains for 2019. We want all subgroups to reach the 50% learning gain benchmark.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Breland (breladg@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Maximizing student accommodations on their IEPs. Utilize an optimal testing schedule. Utilize a systematic, direct instruction reading program to assist in closing reading gaps while accelerating learning in standards-based on grade level instruction. Deliberate practice focuses on increasing learning gains in reading for at least 505 of students. Teach reading every day. Use the PLC process to plan and prepare for instruction in ELA and Math. Continue to individualize and differentiate for our special needs students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We've seen greater gains when our school implemented a systematic direct instruction approach to teaching reading with our special needs population. While we did not have end of year state data to compare, our teacher's felt strongly the program being used during the 19-20 school year did not meet our students needs of reading instructional level text each day. We've seen evidence of better performance when students' accommodations are maximized and the testing schedule is optimal for student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Implement a systematic direct instruction approach to teaching reading to our special needs population, with a school wide focus on teaching reading every day.
2. Utilize District pacing guides and resources for teaching standards based on grade level lessons.
3. Request has been made for an optimal testing schedule
4. Increase all staff's knowledge of providing accommodations for testing in order to maximize the students' accommodations during test administration.
5. Continue planning and preparation for Eureka Math.
6. Monitoring of all subgroups will occur weekly during teacher/student data chats, weekly PLC meetings, and quarterly administrator/teacher data chats through MAPS data, module assessments, and grades.
7. Administrator walk through process (Cord of 3), classroom walkthroughs on site, and administration participation in PLC meetings.

Person Responsible Janie Branstetter (bransjg@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decreasing overall behavioral incidents. Decreasing the number of students experiencing mental health issues resulting in overall behavioral incident.
Measurable Outcome:	Decrease overall behavior incidents by 25%. We had an overall reduction on discipline referrals by 35% and a 14% decrease in majors. We want to focus on decreasing all calls for outside assistance during this school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debbie Breland (breladg@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuing with new protocols for assistance to the classrooms. Coordination between new mental health services.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuing our new protocol matches our trauma sensitive movement in meeting students where they are. It allows all staff to be more educated towards students precipitating factors that could be the root cause of acting out behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to use Call for Assistance with staff and train new staff on Call for Assistance protocol.
2. Staff development in trauma sensitive responses.
3. Fully hire, if at all possible, all support positions to include counseling, telemedicine para, and additional crisis team support position.
4. Continue morning meetings
5. Continue student data notebooks, teacher-student data chats, administration- teacher data chats.

Person Responsible	Janie Branstetter (bransjg@bay.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will continue to monitor all areas of instruction, discipline and attendance primarily through quarterly teacher/administrator data chats. Classroom walk through data will be an additional source of progress monitoring. Attendance will be monitored by our guidance department. We will utilize our new mental health resources to support students with chronic attendance, behavioral and mental health issues through a monthly meeting with administration, guidance and mental health providers.

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.

St Andrew plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders by inviting them to several school activities and sending home a monthly school newsletter. All of our students have an IEP meeting which provides a time so we can throughly communicate strengths, weaknesses and goals with our families. We will actively call parents and community members who are interested in joining our School Advisory Council to personally invite them to our meetings. As we begin the year, we will have a Meet and Greet and Open House in September to meet families and share expectations. An education breakfast, Pastries with Parents, will be served to allow time for parents to learn parent portal and launchpad. We will also have family nights to include: STEM activities, FSA, curriculum, and parent conferences. These fall and spring parent conferences will be important to communicate classroom expectations, curriculum, assessments, standards and parent portal.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**