

St. Johns County School District

# Wards Creek Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kevin Klein**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (66%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Wards Creek Elementary School

6555 STATE ROAD 16, St Augustine, FL 32092

<http://www-wce.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	No	20%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

At WCES we ensure Achievement, Learning and Leadership for ALL.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

To build and sustain a culture that provides a safe environment where all stakeholders collaborate to ensure growth and achievement for ALL.

### 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
Nelson-Mitidieri, Bethany	Principal	To oversee the instruction and operations of all areas of the school.
Klein, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Adolf, Leanne	School Counselor	
Orta, Adriana	Instructional Coach	
Hicks, Lauren	Psychologist	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Kevin Klein

**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.*

35

**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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

49

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (66%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	76	82	100	108	103	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/18/2020

**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	82	90	118	115	109	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	666
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	2	2	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	82	90	118	115	109	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	666
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	2	2	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	4	3	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	79%	75%	57%	74%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	67%	58%	62%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	59%	53%	41%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	77%	63%	75%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	69%	62%	59%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	59%	51%	44%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	72%	53%	76%	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	77%	78%	-1%	58%	19%
	2018	85%	78%	7%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	77%	2%	58%	21%
	2018	67%	74%	-7%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	77%	76%	1%	56%	21%
	2018	74%	73%	1%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	82%	3%	62%	23%
	2018	87%	80%	7%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	81%	82%	-1%	64%	17%
	2018	76%	83%	-7%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	85%	80%	5%	60%	25%
	2018	76%	79%	-3%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	73%	-1%	53%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	73%	0%	55%	18%
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	54	46	55	59	69	68	36				
ASN	75	82		92	100						
HSP	68	67		89	70		71				
MUL	92	86		81	50						
WHT	80	71	69	83	75	61	73				
FRL	68	67	65	79	71	47	67				
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	35	35	33	34	36	33	43				
ASN	70			60							
HSP	67	56		76	75		65				
MUL	84	59		88	59						
WHT	74	63	45	77	71	51	73				
FRL	59	49	34	66	64	42	60				
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	43	54	45	44	46	37	35				
ASN	50			60							
BLK	58			75							
HSP	80	70		69	39						
MUL	94			81							
WHT	74	61	41	75	60	47	75				
FRL	64	59	43	64	52	40	70				

### 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	73

ESSA Federal Index	
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	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	87
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
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.**

While there was a significant improvement from the year before, there is still an achievement gap for SWD in learning gains and achievement in both ELA and Math

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

SWD showed a decline in achievement in Science

**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.**

We were higher than the state average in all areas

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

SWD showed dramatic improvement and in achievement and learning gains in ELA and Math. This was due to intensive, research based interventions and the implementation of an additional ESE teacher

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

There are no real significant areas of concern at this time.

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

1. Achievement of SWD in ELA
2. Learning Gains of SWD in ELA
3. Learning Gains of Lowest 25% in ELA and Math
4. Overall increase in School Grade points
5. Overall increase in learning gains

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The school will raise achievement of the lowest 25% in Reading by 2% from 65% to 67%. This is an identified area of need for the school and the district. Data shows that the students with disabilities at Wards Creek showed a great deal of improvement but still had an achievement gap.

**Measurable Outcome:** Students will show a 2% increase in learning gains based on the 2021 state wide testing data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will receive daily intervention and enrichment. Teachers will use data to differentiate for the needs of students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These are research based strategies and chosen due to past success with their implementation

**Action Steps to Implement**

An additional ESE teacher has been added to lower student/teacher ratios and provide more intensive services.

**Person Responsible** Kevin Klein (kevin.klein@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

School will use research based interventions to close the achievement gap like, Guided Reading and multi-sensory reading.

**Person Responsible** Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The school will raise achievement of the lowest 25% in Math by 2% from 64% to 66%. This is an identified area of need for the school and the district. Data shows that the students with disabilities at Wards Creek showed a great deal of improvement but still had an achievement gap.

**Measurable Outcome:** Students will show a 2% increase in learning gains based on the 2021 state wide testing data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Bethany Nelson-Mitidieri (bethany.nelson-mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will receive daily intervention and enrichment and teachers will use data to drive differentiation of instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies were chosen due to the research behind them and past success with their implementation

**Action Steps to Implement**

An additional ESE teacher has been added to lower student/teacher ratios and provide more intensive services.

**Person Responsible** Bethany Nelson-Mitidieri (bethany.nelson-mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

School will use research based interventions to close the achievement gap like, touch Math and CGI.

**Person Responsible** Adriana Orta (adriana.orta@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will receive feedback and professional development through the Cognitively Guided Instruction project at Florida State University

**Person Responsible** Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Teachers have been chosen to teach in a co-teach model to support students both in the brick and mortar setting and via distance learning. This is a new model for both teachers and families at Wards Creek
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The measurable outcome will be the number of children who successfully participate in Distance Learning and are able to maintain the scope and rigor of brick and mortar.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Bethany Mitidieri (bethany.mitidieri@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will use a site based coaching model to support teachers and students through the process.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Site based coaching is a research based model that has proven a success rate.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Meet weekly for the first month of school to review progress, check implementation and provide support

**Person Responsible** Adriana Orta (adriana.orta@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers and families will receive ongoing professional development and instruction in technology tools such as Schoology, ZOOM and FlipGrid.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Hinman (kimberly.hinman@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

School will have two instructional technology specialists that will be utilized to provide support and guidance for teachers and families.

**Person Responsible** Adriana Orta (adriana.orta@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.

**We will continue to flexibly group students to differentiate and assure that all children receive remediation or enrichment tailored specifically to their areas of need. We will continue to try to lower student teacher ratios in ESE to allow for more concentrated intervention for our SWD.**

**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 relies on the input and feedback of stake holders. There are yearly surveys that are used for decision making for the following year. The School Advisory Council is pivotal in decision making. There is also a student advisory group that works with the principal to make decisions and implement school improvement. The school has a strong PBS program and the county focuses on Character Counts. We hold quarterly Leaders with Character assemblies to recognize students for character, achievement, growth mindset and community service. With the torch being our symbol, we teach children and adult to "Shine their LIGHT" (Leadership, Integrity, Growth Mindset, Heart and Team)

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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