

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Alafia 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Alafia Elementary School

3535 CULBREATH RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Tierney Jackson

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2010

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
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 (68%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Alafia Elementary School

3535 CULBREATH RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[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	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

We will empower all students equitably with the opportunity and support in order to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Alafia Elementary students will be compassionate, connected, and contributing citizens in our ever-changing world.

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
Tierney Jackson, Lisa	Principal	Solicit members for SAC; Build SAC following procedures for SAC voting; Assist in creation of SIP; Ensure SIP is communicated to all stakeholders; Ensure staff SIP voting following procedures; Advertise meetings for SAC and Public; Build agenda with SAC input; Facilitate meetings
McGinnis, Teresa	Assistant Principal	Provide data and Interpret data for SAC/stakeholders; share ideas/collaborate for SIP and assist with SIP implementation
Pletcher, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair - Attend meetings; collaborate/ assist in planning of SIP; assist in SAC agendas -share ideas and areas of concern; assist in interpreting data; publishing SAC minutes for all stakeholders

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/6/2010, Lisa Tierney Jackson

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
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 (68%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	100	91	93	106	87	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Tuesday 6/16/2020

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	94	98	102	91	104	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	98	102	91	104	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	52%	57%	76%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	55%	58%	67%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	54%	63%	77%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	57%	62%	60%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	51%	41%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	50%	53%	73%	48%	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	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
	2018	75%	53%	22%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	55%	28%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	82%	54%	28%	56%	26%
	2018	69%	51%	18%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	54%	20%	62%	12%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	57%	22%	64%	15%
	2018	80%	57%	23%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	73%	54%	19%	60%	13%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	51%	22%	53%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	52%	20%	55%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
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	57	61	58	57	50	25					
ELL	60			80							
ASN	91			91							
BLK	74	63		68	75						
HSP	77	67	71	64	49	13	72				
MUL	77	56		81	50						
WHT	85	75	68	82	69	50	80				
FRL	75	68	62	69	57	21	60				
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	38	37	33	44	55	50	33				
ELL	55			64							
ASN	83			92							
BLK	76	54		68	62						
HSP	76	70	55	70	76	78	68				
MUL	72	64		64	93						
WHT	75	63	43	76	66	50	81				
FRL	62	58	41	59	55	56	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	33	47	38	44	50	29	47				
BLK	86	75		73	69						
HSP	68	51	47	68	63	55	67				
MUL	94	73		82	55						
WHT	74	68	50	78	57	30	73				
FRL	60	57	52	54	34	21	50				

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	70
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	74
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	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	62

Hispanic Students	
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	66
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	73
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	62
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.

According to the 2019 FSA data for Math, 37% of our bottom quartile made gains, which was our lowest component for performance.

* most of the school's RTI focus was for ELA in 2019 school year

* Sub groups in math bottom quartile (Hispanic, SWD, FRL) did not make as great of gains in math as they did in ELA (for example, HSP 71% gains for bottom quartile in ELA and HSP Bottom quartile gains in Math was 13%)

(Below is more data for consideration when looking at 2020-2021 SIP)

iReady & Formative data as of May 2020 for 2019-2020 school year indicates:

ELA- Formative 1 to Formative 2:

Gr 2- 50 to 63 with district at 49
Gr 3 54 to 53.8 with district 44
Gr 4 59 to 64 with district 54
Gr 5 66 to 64 with district 53

I Ready- Reading Data from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2
Gr K- 58 to 90
Gr 1- 51 to 73
Gr 2- 55 to 76
Gr 3- 84 to 85 (District 61)
Gr 4- 55 to 65 (District 48)
Gr 5- 54 to 57 (District 45)

Math- Formative 2
Gr 2 77 to 68 district
Gr 3 71 to 68 district
Gr 4 59 to 55 district
Gr 5 65 to 54 district

I Ready- Math Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 2
52 to 81
45 to 63
35 to 61
18 to 59
21 to 57
35 to 58

Science-
59 to 53.7 district

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

* Sub groups in math bottom quartile (Hispanic, SWD, FRL) did not make as great of gains in math as they did in ELA (for example, HSP 71% gains for bottom quartile in ELA and HSP Bottom quartile gains in Math was 13%)

** most of the school's RTI focus was for ELA in 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.

Math Bottom Quartile: Our school was at 37% making gains the state was at 51% making gains

** most of the school's RTI focus was for ELA in 2018-2019

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

According to the 2019 FSA, our school's bottom quartile for ELA went from 48% in 2018 to 68% in 2019 with a gain of 20%.

* We had a greater focus in our school RTI on making ELA gains in the 2018-2019 school year

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

EWS data for our school shows that for student with 2 or more indicators, Attendance is one of the indicators for most students. The other indicators are divided equally between Behavior and Course Failure.

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

1. Balance our RTi focus across ELA and Math
2. Focus on increasing Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains
3. Focus on Sub Group Hispanics in making learning gains in Math
4. Focus on Sub Group SWD in making learning gains in Math
5. Focus on Sub Group FRL in making learning gains in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Area of focus is in Math instruction. Our number of students in the bottom quartile of Math are not making the same gains as they are in ELA. According to the 2019 FSA for Math, 37% of our BQ made gains which is our lowest component for performance.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 51% of students in the BQ will make gains in the area of Mathematics according to the 2021 FSA for Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Tierney Jackson (lisa.tierney-jackson@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	RTi practices will improve for the area of Math school wide. The PSLT and Teachers will identify students in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 for Math. Teachers within PLC's will discuss RTi strategies and will use data driven discussions to progress monitor and revise strategies for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. The development of strategies and progress monitoring of strategies using data will occur collaboratively within PLC's and the RTi committee along with our PSLT. Communication with the PSLT will be through a virtual communication log to be turned in to administration twice monthly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	RTI is a proven strategy that uses data and a process to address needs of struggling students. It is differentiated in nature dependent on student needs and it is data driven along with providing for intense progress monitoring that allows for fluid intervention dependent on need for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

RTi will be scheduled in and utilized daily in the area of Math in the classroom for all students K-5.

Person Responsible Teresa McGinnis (teresa.mcginis@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Interventions will be discussed and developed based on identified students' needs and progress monitoring will occur based on data with PLC's for Tier 2 and 3, and the RTi committee as needed for students identified as Tier 3 in K-5.

Person Responsible Teresa McGinnis (teresa.mcginis@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

PLC team leaders will communicate with the PSLT through a virtual log twice monthly reporting the progress of students identified as Tier 2 and Tier 3 in the area of math. The communication log will be sent to the principal who will share with the PSLT so we may collaborate with teams in assisting with student growth monitoring process.

Person Responsible Lisa Tierney Jackson (lisa.tierney-jackson@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

According to the 2019 FSA, our school's BQ for ELA increased from 48% in 2018 to 68% in 2019 which is a gain of 20%. We had a greater focus on RTi in ELA in 2019 than in Math with assistance from our school Reading Coach. We were able to utilize our Reading Coach in conducting PD, data analysis and data chats with individual teachers and PLC's, along with developing intervention in response to reading needs. We need to continue these same strategies in ELA for continued improvement in student gains, yet need to balance with Math RTi. If we put all of our focus on Math RTi, our ELA will drop. We need to continue to have a focus on RTi for ELA, while including Math. We need to include the same strategies as listed above for ELA with Math. We must continue to utilize our Reading Coach in data analysis, data chats with PLC's, design and monitoring of RTi for individual students, and PD in best practices. These best practices facilitated and led by our Reading Coach need to be transferred to our ILT to include Math with her guidance and example set through reading.

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.

Each year our stakeholders review our Mission and Vision statements to ensure they match our beliefs and provide equitably for all students.

Alafia has adopted the Sanford Harmony Curriculum for building and promoting a positive school culture. Our staff attended training in the use of Sanford Harmony school-wide. It has been adopted by our Guidance in providing class guidance lessons; the teachers use this platform for building classroom community. School wide we have a Harmony Committee that actively pursues methods that promote a positive school culture.

We have an active PSLT, Teacher leadership team (Steering), ILT, SAC, PTA, Student Government, RTi Committee, and PLC's that meet regularly to ensure we promote a positive school culture and environment that includes all stakeholders.

Alafia holds multiple events that includes local business partners. For example we hold a Kindergarten BooHoo Breakfast and Sneak Peek at the start of each year where many business partners and community partners join us in providing information as well as services to our families (such as Campo YMCA, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, before and after school care givers). We also work with many business partners throughout the school year in various events such as our Walk-a-thon, Spring Carnival and Math Night, to name a few.

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: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00