

Nassau County School District

Emma Love Hardee Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Emma Love Hardee Elementary

2200 SUSAN DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 10/2/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
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)	47%
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 (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Emma Love Hardee Elementary

2200 SUSAN DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[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 3-5	Yes	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 Nassau 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.

Our mission is to establish a positive collaborative work culture that promotes and fosters teaching and learning among the community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To establish a positive collaborative work culture that promotes and fosters teaching and learning among the community of learners. The school's instructional focus will be centered on the use of small groups and include differentiation for all students as well as the integration of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) within literacy blocks. Classroom instruction will include a strong emphasis on the development of a model for vocabulary instruction as well as the teaching of fluency and comprehension skills in Reading and Math blocks. Curriculum will also be spiraled on a daily basis.

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
		<p>The school-based leadership team is responsible for disaggregating and analyzing data to determine areas of deficit. The team is to identify problems within the general population of students and within subgroups of students, analyze why the problems are occurring, formulate an intervention plan and then measure the effectiveness of the interventions through regular progress monitoring. Their plan to address and remediate areas of deficit becomes the basis for the school improvement plan and school action plan. The Leadership team is responsible for ensuring that the school has in place a system that provides increasingly intense and individualized interventions, resources and supports needed to meet the unique needs of its students.</p> <p>In order to identify those needs, the team must analyze data to determine deficits and other areas in need of improvement. The team looks at academic, attendance, and behavior related data. As the team disaggregates the data, it is identifying which students are meeting grade level expectations and which are not. It is looking for patterns and trends in the data. The Leadership team meets monthly.</p>
Smith, Rebecca	Principal	<p>Leading questions: Is our core instruction meeting the needs of 75-80 % of our students? If not, is it a curriculum or instruction issue? Are certain groups of students failing to meet expectations in certain subjects? Or, are there certain groups who have other non-academic barriers to achievement that must be addressed before they will be able to meet academic success? Are there trends in achievement within specific subgroups that need to be addressed? Have resources (funding and staffing) been allocated in the most effective and efficient manner to meet the needs of all stakeholders?</p> <p>Once those areas of need have been identified, the leadership team disseminates this information to the departments, literacy teams and other school based teams. The teams will provide input to the leading questions and assist in determining appropriate research based interventions to remediate specific deficits and identify other available resources to meet individual student needs. The departments/teams oversee the implementation of the interventions and monitor student progress through regularly scheduled meetings. The progress monitoring information will be shared with the leadership team and departments/teams together will monitor the effectiveness of interventions through student progress monitoring data and fidelity checks.</p>
Crews, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Albert, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Hawkins, Mary	School Counselor	
Hodges, Krista	Instructional Media	
Windham, Tanya	Teacher, ESE	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hogue, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	
Scott, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Scholes, Meredith	Teacher, K-12	ELL Teacher grades 3-5
Clark, Ashleigh	Assistant Principal	Assists the Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/2/2017, Rebecca Smith

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School 3-5
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)	47%
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 (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	173	191	185	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	6	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/2/2020

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	215	197	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	20	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	16	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	215	197	222	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	634
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	20	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	16	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	0	3	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	74%	76%	57%	75%	73%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	65%	58%	67%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	54%	53%	50%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	85%	63%	80%	82%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	77%	62%	69%	71%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	67%	51%	56%	64%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	75%	53%	77%	73%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	3	4	5	
	(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	79%	75%	4%	58%	21%
	2018	78%	76%	2%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	68%	2%	58%	12%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	69%	7%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	70%	75%	-5%	56%	14%
	2018	70%	71%	-1%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	80%	83%	-3%	62%	18%
	2018	77%	80%	-3%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	81%	-1%	64%	16%
	2018	81%	83%	-2%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	83%	86%	-3%	60%	23%
	2018	75%	79%	-4%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	70%	73%	-3%	53%	17%
	2018	69%	72%	-3%	55%	14%
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	51	43	41	70	71	67	50				
ELL	41	45	47	65	75	69	27				
BLK	46	34	21	55	60	55	30				
HSP	53	55	44	74	76	67	62				
MUL	71	71		74	81		40				
WHT	81	65	56	88	79	71	83				

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
FRL	63	55	47	73	72	65	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	46	52	60	55	58	58	25				
ELL	23	46	50	57	64	60					
BLK	58	73	61	57	53	42	48				
HSP	49	56	56	68	72	55	50				
MUL	50	42		58	32						
WHT	82	62	51	86	72	59	78				
FRL	61	55	44	69	64	53	56				
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	34	26	46	50	44	33				
ELL	33	53	50	48	40	18					
BLK	56	63	56	59	59	53	67				
HSP	59	63	38	63	54	29	55				
MUL	85	77	90	77	70	70	54				
WHT	80	69	43	86	73	65	85				
FRL	62	58	43	67	63	55	65				

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	67
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56

Students With Disabilities	
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	53
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	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	61
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	75
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	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.

Our lower quartile students in ELA performed the lowest school-wide. It has been a trend over the last three years.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from last years was ELA Learning Gains from 61% to 58%.

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 largest gap compared to the state average occurred with Math Learning Gains overall. School data shows a gap of 25% over the state. School data for Math Learning Gains show show 77% and the state shows just 62%.

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

Math Achievement and Math Learning Gains have shown the most improvement. ELH utilized paras in Math during small group instruction especially in classrooms with the highest need.

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

After reflecting on our EWS data, we will continue to monitor and implement strategies that will improve attendance, along with assisting students daily who attained a Level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. School-wide ELA achievement while focusing on the learning gains for our lower quartile in ELA.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Emma Love Hardee scored 74% achievement proficiency school-wide for ELA in 2019. Our District's expectation is 80%, so we chose to increase proficiency in ELA by utilizing several strategies and action steps below especially focusing on our lower quartile students. Our iReady BOY data for Fall 2020 supports this decision, as we are 47% proficient with end of the year grade level standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency will increase from 74% in 2019 to 80% in 2021 school-wide as indicated on the FSA ELA Achievement Component and 47% to 80% as indicated on the iReady ELA Tier 1 Proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rebecca Smith (smithre@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategy used is intentional differentiated ELA instruction based on data from diagnostic assessments to progress monitor individual student achievement and growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on previous FSA and various assessments using iReady, STAR and Benchmarks, our data reveals the need for continued adjustments in differentiating small group instruction and providing targeted additional instruction through intervention blocks such as After School Tutoring and "EMMA Time" (In-school support time for intervention)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
 2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS and supported by the A-Team
 3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need
 4. Intervention Time (EMMA Time!) utilized with students needing support of specific skills and standards
 5. Professional Development focused on differentiation and instruction of vocabulary and comprehension
- Person Responsible** Rebecca Smith (smithre@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on 2019 attendance data, 7% of ELH students did not maintain a 90% attendance rate. According to first quarter attendance data 2020, ELH is showing that 5% of ELH students is not maintaining a 90% attendance rate. It appears that our attendance is improving; however, ELH's 2020 enrollment has decreased by 85 students.

Measurable Outcome: At the end of the 2021 school year, the goal at ELH is to decrease the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year from 7% to 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Smith (smithre@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Parent communication will be used to bring awareness of attendance policy and to implement student, classroom, and school-wide positive reinforcers regarding attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is evident that parent/student communication and reinforcements is needed to express the importance of attendance and the correlation to student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Positive reinforcement of attendance
2. Attendance policy clarified at parent conferences
3. Parent letters and phone calls from teachers following up on absences
4. Tiered system of support and intervention for attendance through A-Team

Person Responsible Rebecca Smith (smithre@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

ELH identified ELA as the focus this year, but will continue to monitor Math Achievement data based on diagnostic assessments from iReady.

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.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen parent involvement in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies including community involvement opportunities and business partnerships.

The school will provide the coordination, technical assistance, and other support necessary to assist in planning and implementing effective and comprehensive parent involvement programs, based on the National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs, which include:

- A. Communication between home and school is regular, two-way and meaningful.
- B. Responsible parenting is promoted and supported.
- C. Parents play an integral role in assisting student learning. The School will help parents understand the state’s academic standards, student progression requirements, and how to monitor their children’s progress.
- D. Parents are welcome in school, treated with courtesy and respect, and their support and assistance are sought.
- E. Parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families.
- F. Community resources are utilized to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning.

The school will communicate parental choices and responsibilities to parents. Emphasis will be placed on active parent involvement at each school. The following are examples of family and community involvement communication:

- Open House, Parent Nights (STEAM, Literacy)
- School Web Page
- Focus
- Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
- Parent phone calls, Blackboard, and conferences, school marquee, Remind 101

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------