

Dixie District Schools

# Kinder Cub School Inc



2021-22 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>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Kinder Cub School Inc

149 NE 221ST AVE, Cross City, FL 32628

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Aimee Underwood**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-2
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2020-21: No Grade  2018-19: No Grade  2017-18: No Grade  2016-17: No Grade
<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>	

\* 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 Dixie 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](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>17</b>

# Kinder Cub School Inc

149 NE 221ST AVE, Cross City, FL 32628

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-2</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">%</p>

## School Grades History

Year  
Grade

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dixie 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.

Kinder Cub School will partner with our community and with student families to provide a solid foundation in reading and math for our students from which an empire of knowledge can grow and thrive.

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

Teachers, parents, and students united for the success of all students.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Brown, Christina	Teacher, K-12	To provide insight into the needs of the Pk-2 students.
Burton, Melanie	Teacher, ESE	To provide insight into the Pk-2 ESE student population.
Underwood, Aimee	Principal	To provide leadership and data analysis on student achievement and needs.
Taylor, Larry	Teacher, K-12	To provide experience and insight into the PK-2 student and curriculum.
Harris, Rita	Principal	To provide leadership and experience with Pk-2 students

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/3/2021, Aimee Underwood

**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.*

0

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

6

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

118

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

0

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

1

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**2021-22**

**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	32	36	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	7	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

**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	7	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Wednesday 8/18/2021

**2020-21 - 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	35	34	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**2020-21 - 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	35	34	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	8	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					59%	57%		56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains					58%	58%		41%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					51%	53%		38%	48%
Math Achievement					70%	63%		61%	62%
Math Learning Gains					72%	62%		50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					66%	51%		36%	47%
Science Achievement					60%	53%		72%	55%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady and ESGI

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34	34	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34	34	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	10	10	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	18	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	17	17
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	18	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	17	17
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	4
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	30	31		34	31		40				
BLK	25			28							
WHT	57	53	36	61	48	47	61				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
FRL	47	59	43	52	50	38	67				
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
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

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	350
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

**Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Based on the SAT10 data, students had a higher percentage rate for proficiency in math than reading across grade levels.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

Based on the End of Year iReady Reading Diagnostic, the areas of need were in vocabulary and literature comprehension.

Based on the End of Year iReady Math Diagnostic, the areas of need were number sense and measurement and data.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Teachers will provide small group learning using comprehension and vocabulary programs that are engaging and motivating to strengthen the weak areas of need. Students will be encouraged to use self-monitoring and reflection to monitor their progress.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Based on iReady testing data, in the area of reading, the most improvement was shown in informational comprehension. In the area of math, the most improvement was shown in the area of geometry.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Contributing factors for this improvement could be from the integration of reading through the science and social studies curriculums. As for math, the implementation of added new curriculum to enhance problem solving opportunities was beneficial and contributed to the improvement. In addition, analyzing the students' response to interventions to create engaging and motivating lessons that provide explicit instruction in the student needs.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

We will set learning goals and communicate clear expectations to our students. We will use comprehension programs that use a variety of texts to expose our students to a variety of genres to increase comprehension skills. Implement Saxon math in our math program to increase mathematics concept knowledge.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

iReady training will be done to provide teachers with instruction on how to best utilize the components to target key learning skills. Teachers will continue reviewing and analyzing the new B.E.S.T. standards to implement all pieces successfully for productive student learning in all areas.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Establish PLC where teachers collaborate together to share strategies and techniques to best support all of our students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus**  
**Description and Rationale:** Based on the End of Year iReady Reading diagnostic, KCS overall had 68% of our students at mid or above grade level in the area of reading with literature comprehension and vocabulary the weakest areas.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the End of Year iReady Reading diagnostic 2022, our students schoolwide will increase the percentage of students on mid/above grade level percent from 68% to 72%.

**Monitoring:** We will monitor by evaluating a variety of assessments including mid and EOY iready diagnostic, formal and informal class assessments, and others based on the grade levels.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rita Harris (ritalharris@bellsouth.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** KCS will implement an immediate and intensive TIER intervention program focusing on individual student skill deficiencies in reading. The evidence-based strategies that will be implemented during this intervention will include: small group instruction (effect size .47), phonics instruction (effect size .70), RTI (effect size 1.29), scaffolding (effect size .82), and questioning (effect size .48).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students who are in need of additional assistance through a tiered system intervention learn best in small group or one-to-one situations. Using a systematic and repetitive intervention for these students best meets their needs. The rationale for the selected evidence-based strategies above is (according to evidence from Hattie's Visible Learning Strategies study) when these evidence-based strategies are implemented with fidelity they have been shown to accelerate or considerably accelerate student achievement, as shown by their effect size of .40 or greater.

#### Action Steps to Implement

- Share SIP focus and goals with all faculty.
- Give initial diagnostic testing to all students.
- Analyze data to determine student needs.
- Provide teachers with materials and/or programs of support to use during tiered intervention time (i.e. additional resources to provide hands-on practice related to skill needs).
- Reassess progress through frequent progress checks, and at mid/EOY, continuously making changes as needed based on data.

**Person Responsible:** Rita Harris (ritalharris@bellsouth.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the End of Year iReady Math diagnostic, KCS overall had 73% of our students at mid or above grade level in the area of number sense and measurement and data.

**Measurable Outcome:** By the End of Year iReady Math diagnostic 2022, our student schoolwide will increase the percentage of students on mid/above grade level percent from 73% to 77%.

**Monitoring:** We will monitor by evaluating a variety of assessments including mid and EOY iReady diagnostic, formal and informal class assessments, and others based on the grade levels.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rita Harris (ritaharris@bellsouth.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** KCS will implement an immediate and intensive TIER intervention program focusing on individual student skill deficiencies in math. The evidence-based strategies that will be implemented during this intervention will include: small group instruction (effect size .47), RTI (effect size 1.29), scaffolding (effect size .82), and questioning (effect size .48).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The rationale for selecting this strategy is that students who are in need of additional assistance through a tiered system intervention learn best in small group or one-to-one situations. Using a systematic and repetitive intervention for these students best meets their needs. The rationale for the selected evidence-based strategies above is (according to evidence from Hattie's Visible Learning Strategies study) when these evidence-based strategies are implemented with fidelity they have been shown to accelerate or considerably accelerate student achievement, as shown by their effect size of .40 or greater.

### Action Steps to Implement

- Share SIP focus and goals with all faculty.
- Give initial diagnostic testing to all students.
- Analyze data to determine student needs.
- Provide teachers with materials and/or programs of support to use during tiered intervention time (i.e. additional resources to provide hands-on practice related to skill needs).
- Reassess progress through frequent progress checks, and at mid/EOY, continuously making changes as needed based on data.

**Person Responsible:** Rita Harris (ritaharris@bellsouth.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**Kinder Cub School was not found on this website. We have cameras in each classroom that help to monitor student behaviors. We will focus on students with behaviors that are disruptive in the class. We will counsel with the students and continue to encourage them to do their best while teaching independence and consequences to their actions that fit the behavior.**



### 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.

Kinder Cub strives daily to build a positive culture and environment. Maintaining strong parent to school relationships is vital. We maintain this by providing our parents with the necessary knowledge to help their child at home, along with daily communication and community events. We provide our parents with a Parent Involvement Handbook-Read At Home Plan that indicates individual student assessments, their child's greatest area(s) of need and how to assist them in one of the six areas of reading proficiency: phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, high-frequency words, vocabulary, and comprehension. As well as math concept practice. Here we are a team, where everyone is working hard to supply what each child needs. We focus not only the academics for our students, but the whole child, making sure they feel welcome and learn life long skills to be well rounded individuals.

#### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

KCS is a small school with limited resources. However, our board members are active in the local education association. We contract with a local mental health and social services company. We also participate in community outreach programs including: Literacy Week with courthouse officials, Honoring our local veteran hero's, and our local nursing home Easter luncheon. Yearly KCS brings in groups that provide forms of the arts. They include puppeteers and art education. These stakeholders ensure that our students receive more than academics but a well-rounded understanding of the importance of community and diversity in their lives.

### 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: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>