

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Twin Lakes 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	18

Twin Lakes Elementary School

8507 N HABANA AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Daphne Fourqurean

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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.

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	18

Twin Lakes Elementary School

8507 N HABANA AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

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;">93%</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;">94%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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 provide a safe environment where students' efforts are recognized and they are encouraged to develop skills that enable them to excel in a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering a community of learners and leaders.

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
Batista, Kilsys	Principal	The safety and education of all students.
Osborn, JamesL	Assistant Principal	The safety and education of all students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Daphne Fourqurean

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.*

0

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

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* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (40%)
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	82	83	81	107	84	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	512
Attendance below 90 percent	17	16	15	26	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	19	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	0	1	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	6	6	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	91	105	101	105	85	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	10	13	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	15	36	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	2	0	0	0	0	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	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	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	91	105	101	105	85	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	596
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	10	13	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	15	36	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109

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	2	0	0	0	0	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	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	38%	52%	57%	46%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	50%	53%	59%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	37%	54%	63%	37%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	57%	62%	45%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	51%	33%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	50%	53%	39%	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	33%	52%	-19%	58%	-25%
	2018	35%	53%	-18%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	30%	55%	-25%	58%	-28%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
	2018	37%	51%	-14%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	54%	-29%	62%	-37%
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	36%	54%	-18%	60%	-24%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	61%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	51%	-16%	53%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	29%	52%	-23%	55%	-26%
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	13	28	32	16	42	38	10				
ELL	31	45	34	37	55	44	49				
BLK	37	38		36	46		33				
HSP	36	46	39	36	54	40	38				
WHT	48	45		37	43		33				
FRL	38	44	35	37	52	41	40				
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	21	34	35	19	41	50					
ELL	36	49	34	31	55	54	20				
ASN	83	73		67	55						
BLK	41	41		42	48						
HSP	38	46	39	36	54	49	30				
WHT	42	50		35	53						
FRL	39	46	43	37	52	47	29				
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	8	34	44	16	29	22					
ELL	43	49	48	28	32	27	23				
ASN	67	70		87	70						
BLK	32	48		38	45		38				
HSP	47	56	56	34	43	29	36				
WHT	48	58		33	35		38				
FRL	43	55	59	34	45	35	33				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	45
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
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	41
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	44
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.

Student proficiency on the 2019 FSA ELA was 38% for students in grades 3-5, a drop of 3% from 2018.

Student proficiency on the 2019 FSA Math was 37% for students in grades 3-5, a drop of 1% from 2018.

Student learning gains on the 2019 FSA ELA was 46% for students in grades 3-5, a drop of 2% from 2018.

Student learning gains on the 2019 FSA Math was 52% for students in grades 3-5, a drop of 2% from 2018.

Students in the Lowest 25th Percentile on the 2019 FSA ELA was 35% for grades 3-5, a drop of 7% from 2018.

Students in the lowest 25th Percentile on the 2019 FSA Math was 37% for grades 3-5, a drop of 9% from 2018.

iReady Winter Diagnostic administered between December 2019 and February 2020 demonstrates the following:

READING: 35% (37% in 2018-2019) of students at Tier 1, 40% (42% in 2018-2019) of students at Tier 2 (1 year below grade level), and 24% (21% in 2018-2019) of students at Tier 3 (at least 2 years below grade level).

MATH: 23% (30% in 2018-2019) of students at Tier 1, 57% (54% in 2018-2019) of students at Tier 2 (1 year below grade level), and 20% (16% in 2018-2019) of students at Tier 3 (at least 2 years below grade level).

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

According to the iReady Winter Diagnostic, the percent of students performing at grade level (Tier 1) dropped 2% from 2018-2019 in Reading and a drop of 13% in Math. Both Reading and Math had an increase in the percent of students performing at least 2 years below grade level (Tier 3), +3% in Reading and +4% in Math.

In review of 2019-2020 iReady data along with prior 2019 FSA data, student proficiency in Reading and Math demonstrated a decline. Students in the lowest 25th Percentile in 2019 FSA ELA and Math had the greatest decline as compared to 2018 FSA, -7% in ELA and -9% in Math.

A factor that contributed to the decline in student performance was the inconsistent use of effective teaching methods to include differentiated instruction along with lack of knowledge of state standards.

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.

Student proficiency on the 2019 FSA ELA was 38% for students in grades 3-5, a difference of -19% compared to the state.

Student proficiency on the 2019 FSA Math was 37% for students in grades 3-5, a difference of -26% compared to the state.

A factor that contributed to the decline in student performance was the inconsistent use of effective teaching methods to include differentiated instruction along with lack of knowledge of state standards.

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

Students in Kindergarten performing at Tier 1 on the iReady Winter Diagnostic in 2019-2020 increased 11% from the prior year. Students in grades K and 1 participated in the Really Great Reading Foundation Skills program on a consistent and daily basis.

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

The number of students with one or more suspensions in 2019 increased to 28 from 3 as reported in 2018.

The number of students with Below 90% Attendance was 62, approximately 11% of our student population.

The number of students performing at Level 1 in ELA in 4th and 5th grade is 79 and 90 in Math.

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

1. School Culture
2. High Quality Instructional Design

- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student learning would be positively impacted by being in an environment the promotes positive behavior and values trust, respect, and high expectations. In review of the 2019-2020 student data, a significant increase in office referrals was evident, including the total number of students with one or more suspensions. In the 2018-2019 year 99% of students had zero suspensions and in 2019-2020 year 96% of students had zero suspensions, a drop of 3%.
Measurable Outcome:	The total number of suspensions at the end of the 2020-2021 year will decrease by a minimum of 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a behavior support system that is aligned with MTSS, supporting students according to the level of intervention needed to be successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports increases desired student behavior and allows for early intervention of unwanted behaviors to escalate in turn allowing for an environment centered around student academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and students will follow the schoolwide behavior plan which will include: core values and expectations for learner behaviors, positive reinforcement and logical consequences, individualized behavior plans for students in Tier 2 and Tier 3, individual and class recognition, weekly class meetings focused on promoting a positive culture for learning. Student's response to the behavior plan will be monitored by the Problem Solving Leadership Team, PSLT.

Person Responsible JamesL Osborn (jamesl.osborn@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Standards-aligned instruction in all content areas will include clear learning intentions with an aligned learning task, criteria for success, and plans to address student academic needs.

Measurable Outcome: Student proficiency for Students with Disabilities will increase from 30% to 41% on the 2021 FSA.
 Student proficiency for Black/African American Student will increase from 38% to 41% on the 2021 FSA.

Students performing at or above grade level on the 2021 iReady Spring Diagnostic will increase to a minimum of 40% in both Reading and Math. Most recent data demonstrates 35% on grade level in Reading and 23% on grade level Math on the 2019-2020 iReady Winter Diagnostic.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional design will engage all learners with clear learning intentions aligned to state standards, criteria for success, and plans to address student academic needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: High quality instructional design will engage all learners with clear learning intentions, criteria for success, and plans to address student academic needs.
 Teacher clarity includes what students need to learn, communicating the learning intention, and having an understanding of the criteria that determines success. Teacher clarity has an effect size of .75 based on Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, and John Hattie's research in Visible Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly grade level collaborative planning to include unpacking of state standards and identifying: the learning intention aligned to the standard, the learning task with appropriate complexity level, and the success criteria to evaluate learning.

Person Responsible Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Job embedded professional development will be based on student data/teacher needs and provided through coaching cycles, model lessons, learning walks, PLCs, teacher workshops, and book studies.

Person Responsible Kilsys Batista (kilsys.batista@hcps.net)

Identify students in the Bottom Quartile based on the 2019 FSA data and 2020 Winter iReady Diagnostic and provide intensive intervention for all groups including Students with Disabilities and Black/African American students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00