Crestwood Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Crestwood Elementary School

7824 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Diane Sanchez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan 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.](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

Crestwood Elementary School

7824 N MANHATTAN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[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	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

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

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 to become creative thinkers and respectful, responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Strive for P.R.I.D.E.

P- Positive
R- Respectful
I- Innovative
D-Driven
E-Engaged

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
Sanchez, Diane	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chairs School Psychologist/ Behavior team Representative School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) ESE teachers PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area District support (including Area Superintendents, Support Specialist, District Coaches) The Leadership team meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly). The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		instructional improvement.
		Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.
		Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who have demonstrated positive student impact.
		Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.
Belliamy, Pat	Assistant Principal	
Shane , Jessica	Instructional Media	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/8/2020, Diane Sanchez

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.*
4

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
52

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)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	115	130	124	127	161	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	783
Attendance below 90 percent	35	29	25	30	38	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	19	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	2	4	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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

Monday 11/2/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	29	29	27	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	1	15	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	29	29	27	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	3	1	2	8	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	1	1	15	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	50%	52%	57%	41%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	50%	53%	61%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	50%	54%	63%	39%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	51%	51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	50%	53%	35%	48%	51%

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

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	56%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	43%	51%	-8%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	54%	-12%	62%	-20%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
	2018	40%	57%	-17%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	48	49	23	54	46	18				
ELL	44	63	67	50	65	59	49				
ASN	80	92		80	100						
BLK	43	63		29	37						
HSP	48	62	64	50	61	54	47				
MUL	55			64							
WHT	68	83		50	58						
FRL	48	63	63	49	61	53	45				
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	19	31	35	29	41	24	30				
ELL	37	54	60	46	59	46	5				
ASN	65	77		90	92		60				
BLK	46	42		33	42						
HSP	42	54	55	47	55	43	36				
WHT	46	59		46	59						
FRL	43	53	54	47	56	43	41				
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	17	59	64	19	42	33	13				
ELL	33	51	59	34	45	48	22				
ASN	63	63		58	58						
BLK	31	40		32	45		23				
HSP	39	55	61	38	54	54	35				
WHT	48	59		44	53						
FRL	39	55	60	38	52	49	34				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	57
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	88
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	43
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	56

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	60
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	65
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	55
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.

The science achievement showed the lowest performance in school wide data. For grade level data, 3rd grade math performed the lowest. In sub group data, students with disabilities performed the lowest. The contributing factors continue to be students' vocabulary and comprehension deficits.

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

The greatest decline from prior years were 3rd grade math and the students with disabilities in science. For school wide data, all areas increased. The decline was contributed to a weak vocabulary and comprehension skills.

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

The areas that showed the greatest gap compared to the State data were nath which was 13 points lower than the State overall. 3rd grade math showed a deficit of 20% compared to the State.

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

The data which showed the most improvement was ELA learning gains which was 10 points above the prior year. The grade level which showed the most improvement from the prior year was 4th grade ELA. The subgroup which showed the most improvement was ELL in science which increased 44 points.

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

Based on the EWS data the areas of most concern were 3rd grade ELA and Math performance as well as school wide attendance of 90% or higher.

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

1. ELA
2. SWD
3. ELL
4. Attendance
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Enhance the culture of teaching and learning in order to improve student achievement in all content areas with priority given to: 1. ELA, 2. SWD, 3. ELL, 4. attendance, 5. science. FSA ELA data revealed a need for improvement to student achievement levels. In addition, iReady and District Formative data indicated skill based deficiencies. Research shows that when high quality instruction is the norm, it positively impacts student achievement as they are more motivated and engaged in learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Teacher evaluation/observation results will identify improvements in the domains of engagement and assessment. The ongoing iReady, informal and Formative assessments throughout the year will show an increase in proficiency in student performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based strategies will be used to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Such as standards based planning, data-driven differentiated professional development, goal setting, genuine discussions that reveal student understanding of learning outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers have clear high quality instruction and rigorous understanding of the standards, this will ensure increased student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement standards based instruction incorporating foundational skills and assessment of learning target.
2. Utilize data to develop rigorous differentiated opportunities for students to engage in high level of learning.

Person Responsible	Diane Sanchez (diane.sanchez1@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

a. Before: teachers will know which standard to focus on, bring materials, and bring resources to share.
During:offer ideas, share examples of student work, be a problem solver
After: follow through on commitments
b. emphasis on content area vocabulary instruction through visuals, interactive or concrete examples.
c. explicit teaching of foundational skills through skill based mini lessons daily/weekly
d. utilize a variety of formal and informal data points for weekly planning ad instruction
e. gather formal and/or informal assessment data throughout lessons
f. establish routines and structures for higher order questioning to monitor student understanding
g. students demonstrate understanding of learning outcomes through discussion and products.
h. differentiated incorporating learning modalities and fluid data based grouping
i. differentiated professional development according to school and grade level needs
Resources:
Burke Book
Literacy and Language Guide
Vocabulary notebooks

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

The school builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders in many ways. Such as family nights, conference night, informational sessions about FSA, iReady, and grade levels, parent links, newsletter, business partnerships as volunteers,

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: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**