

St. Johns County School District

South Woods 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

South Woods Elementary School

4750 SR 206 W, Elkton, FL 32033

<http://www-swe.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Angela Rodgers

Start Date for this Principal: 11/30/2020

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

South Woods Elementary School

4750 SR 206 W, Elkton, FL 32033

<http://www-swe.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

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	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

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.

South Woods Elementary School will create a positive learning environment that will instill good character and the desire for academic excellence, fostering the development of caring, productive, and digital citizens in the global world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

South Woods students will communicate, collaborate, and solve problems in all academic areas to a high standard. Our students will have the necessary digital skills to perform in the school/home/work place and in the global society in which they live. Students will be lifelong learners that exhibit good character and contributors to their neighborhood, community and world.

At South Woods, we believe that:

- ~ the school serves and exists to provide the best educational opportunity for all.
- ~ the best educational environment is one which makes available opportunities to practice basic skills, receive instruction in the various disciplines, use technology tools, and provide rigor in the curriculum.
- ~ the best educational opportunities allow each student to learn to his/her fullest potential.
- ~ each student should be able to learn whatever he or she is studying while demonstrating a level of mastery in all grade level standards.
- ~ efficient learning requires a planned sequence of teaching / learning experiences aimed at specific goals.
- ~ education's purpose is to help students become independent, self-directed individuals capable of achieving goals while also serving the good of society.
- ~ school must help students to increase their self-respect, respect of others, appreciation of differences, and understanding that developing good character should be a priority.

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
Rodgers, Angela	Principal	
Ambrose, Diana	School Counselor	
Cunningham, Sally	Instructional Coach	
Bielefeldt, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
English, Dana	Administrative Support	
Ramos, Nicole	Attendance/Social Work	
Fuce, Linda	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/30/2020, Angela Rodgers

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.*

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	105	107	125	104	98	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	15	21	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	7	6	8	6	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	14	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	2	13	27	12	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	0	3	4	24	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	102	117	89	114	96	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	18	23	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	6	8	5	20	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	4	0	10	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	11	11	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	6	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	102	117	89	114	96	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	18	23	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	6	8	5	20	18	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	14	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	3	4	0	10	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	11	11	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	6	10	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	53%	75%	57%	55%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	67%	58%	51%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	59%	53%	48%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	77%	63%	71%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	69%	62%	76%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	59%	51%	65%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	72%	53%	51%	69%	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	50%	78%	-28%	58%	-8%
	2018	60%	78%	-18%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	77%	-27%	58%	-8%
	2018	38%	74%	-36%	56%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	53%	76%	-23%	56%	-3%
	2018	38%	73%	-35%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	68%	82%	-14%	62%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	80%	-11%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	82%	-19%	64%	-1%
	2018	65%	83%	-18%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	65%	80%	-15%	60%	5%
	2018	62%	79%	-17%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	73%	-13%	53%	7%
	2018	43%	73%	-30%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
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	28	48	48	39	53	52	37				
BLK	47	52		40	61		50				
HSP	41	54		71	92						
MUL	50			60							
WHT	56	62	60	74	70	59	67				
FRL	53	63	59	66	75	63	62				
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	20	22	24	43	47	45	12				
BLK	32	31	38	47	41	42	11				
HSP	35	25		74	81						
MUL	40			50							
WHT	49	40	31	71	62	46	51				
FRL	36	31	33	62	53	43	33				

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	19	35	44	46	75	67	18				
BLK	28	41	50	56	70	57	25				
HSP	35	36		82	100						
WHT	65	54	46	75	75	63	63				
FRL	49	47	48	66	75	64	46				

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	60
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	422
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	65
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	55
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	64
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	63
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 ELA achievement (53%) was the lowest performing area. Although achievement increased 8% this past year, contributing factors including lack of parental participation in student learning, student absenteeism and teachers new to the school and assessed grade level have an impact on consistent growth from year to year.

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

None of the school grade component areas declined from last year, but Math achievement remained the same at 66%.

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 math learning gains had the largest gap when compared to the state average but we scored 8% higher than the state average. ELA achievement (53%) was 4% below the state level. Although achievement increased 8% this past year, contributing factors including lack of parental participation in student learning, student absenteeism and teachers new to the school and assessed grade level have an impact on consistent growth from year to year.

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

The ELA learning gains showed the most improvement increasing from 36% in 2018 to 60% in 2019. New actions our school took were increased accountability and monitoring of interventions.

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

Based on the EWS data, our area of concern is student attendance and out of school suspensions.

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

1. Increased accountability and monitoring of Tier 1 instruction
2. Increased accountability and monitoring of interventions for students with Tier 2 and 3 plans, students with IEPs, and students in the lowest quartile in reading and math
3. Targeted professional development for teachers and interventionist in reading, writing and math
4. Increased monitoring and follow up for student attendance and out of school suspensions
5. Increased opportunity for parent participating in student learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

According to the 2019 FSA data, 55% of the lowest quartile students demonstrated learning gains in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will increase from 55% in 2019 to 57% in 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The Leadership Team will monitor effectiveness by attending grade level PLCs, tracking student data, and tracking teacher observations. Throughout the year, the leadership team will track iReady ELA data with the 2021 ELA FSA data being used as our final indicator. Teachers will work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

ELA student data and teacher observations are being used because they are measurable. Collaborative teams will work together to increase proficiency and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative team determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data and plan for instruction. Reteaching and interventions will occur based on data from student formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible

Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

According to the 2019 FSA data, 58% of the lowest quartile students demonstrated learning gains in math.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% will increase from 58% in 2019 to 60% in 2021.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

The Leadership Team will monitor effectiveness by attending grade level PLCs, tracking student data, and tracking teacher observations. Throughout the year, the leadership team will track iReady Math data with the 2021 Math FSA data being used as our final indicator. Teachers will work as a collaborative teams to determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data, and plan instructional next steps to ensure that all student learn.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Math student data and teacher observations are being used because they are measurable. Collaborative teams will work together to increase proficiency and learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative team determine essential standards, analyze formative assessment data and plan for instruction. Reteaching and interventions will occur based on data from student formative and summative assessments.

**Person
Responsible**

Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing the Early Warning Systems data, the number of students with one or more suspensions increased from 28 to 65. The number of students that had an attendance rate below 90%, increased from 95 students to 116 students.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2020-21 we will reduce absenteeism by 2% and decrease the number of out of school suspensions by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Randy Kelley (randy.kelley@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through weekly Core MTSS meetings the data for attendance and student behavior resulting in suspensions will be monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The MTSS Core team will monitor student data for attendance and suspensions. Team members have the resources to support students who demonstrate poor attendance or struggle with behavior that results in suspension from school.

Action Steps to Implement

The MTSS Core team monitors student attendance and discipline data including suspensions weekly. The team takes action to support and follow up weekly and progress. For students who continue to demonstrate concern, the team will meet to develop an intervention plan.

Person Responsible Angela Rodgers (angela.rodgers@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

South Woods develops a positive school culture and environment by developing meaningful relationships with students, parents and the community. Additionally, we focus on each student individually to support their learning path.

Positive relationships are developed with students thorough our PBIS and Conscious Discipline approach to student development. All students feel valued and understand common expectation and procedures. Relationships are developed with our parents and community with though parent conferences, curriculum events, frequent communication, family fun nights and through school and community services provided by our Community Partnership School.

We focus on each student learning path through our collaborative learning teams, MTSS process and guidance and support services.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.