

The School District of Desoto

Memorial Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Memorial Elementary School

851 E HICKORY ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

<http://mes.desotoschools.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Amanda IR By

Start Date for this Principal: 11/20/2017

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Desoto County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Memorial Elementary School

851 E HICKORY ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

<http://mes.desotoschools.com/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Desoto 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.

The mission of Memorial Elementary School is to empower students to become life-long learners and leaders, while providing a safe, challenging, nurturing and positive educational environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision that Memorial Elementary provide a rigorous and relevant education for all students through ambitious instruction.

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
Irby, Amanda	Principal	My role is to provide strategic directions for Memorial Elementary School. As the school principal I have assisted in developing standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
McGill, Sally	Assistant Principal	Discussing student behavior and learning problems with parents. Implementing school safety procedures and ensuring compliance. Handling disciplinary issues. Observing and evaluating teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 11/20/2017, Amanda IR By

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

950

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

3

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

6

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	128	130	136	140	151	176	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	861
Attendance below 90 percent	0	36	32	29	31	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	2	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	2	32	33	25	15	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in Math	2	15	18	17	21	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	15	30	31	35	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143

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	13	16	27	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	2	1	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/30/2021

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	0	147	155	136	180	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	75	76	49	59	47	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	12	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	13	32	17	25	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in Math	5	16	22	27	36	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	43	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	48	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	17	32	18	43	50	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205

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	4	4	4	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	147	155	136	180	179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	75	76	49	59	47	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
One or more suspensions	4	4	4	12	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	13	32	17	25	29	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in Math	5	16	22	27	36	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	25	43	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	19	48	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	17	32	18	43	50	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205

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	4	4	4	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				41%	38%	57%	36%	34%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	52%	58%	51%	48%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	51%	53%	51%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	45%	63%	43%	41%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	57%	62%	56%	49%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	55%	51%	45%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				32%	37%	53%	33%	33%	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
03	2021					
	2019	35%	34%	1%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	37%	7%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	41%	0%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	40%	40%	0%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	51%	15%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	43%	7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	36%	-6%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool used for this data was STAR Renaissance Reading and Math.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	60	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	60	42
	Students With Disabilities	20	40	17
	English Language Learners	18	50	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48	67	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	48	49
	Students With Disabilities	57	67	81
	English Language Learners	52	65	88
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	67	49

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	53	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	53	48
	Students With Disabilities	46	46	86
	English Language Learners	12	19	58
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	34	57	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	57	42
	Students With Disabilities	46	62	79
	English Language Learners	33	35	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	23	42	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	42	34
	Students With Disabilities	8	14	47
	English Language Learners	19	6	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	58	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	58	40
	Students With Disabilities	46	36	47
	English Language Learners	31	38	43
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	30	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	30	25
	Students With Disabilities	33	27	27
	English Language Learners	2	16	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	43	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	43	38
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	33
	English Language Learners	29	36	61
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	36	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	35	33
	Students With Disabilities	29	19	38
	English Language Learners	0	3	31
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	52	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	52	48
	Students With Disabilities	33	48	63
	English Language Learners	16	33	72
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	14	.04	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	.04	26
	Students With Disabilities	.06	0	.06
	English Language Learners	0	0	11

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	12	44		19	68		19				
ELL	22	45	44	44	65	56	30				
BLK	28	54		28	42		28				
HSP	31	43	50	43	61	60	33				
WHT	46	48		62	76	80	58				
FRL	30	43	46	39	58	63	37				
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	14	39	35	38	67	44	10				
ELL	33	61	42	56	76	65	26				
BLK	31	39	27	39	58	69	27				
HSP	41	58	42	56	70	57	30				
MUL	82			73							
WHT	43	47	64	49	65	65	34				
FRL	39	52	44	53	65	60	28				
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	11	45	55	20	32	21	13				
ELL	21	55	69	40	65	59	17				
BLK	33	37	25	34	57	38	24				
HSP	34	55	59	47	58	45	33				
MUL	27			45							
WHT	42	52	43	41	50	44	38				
FRL	35	50	46	43	56	44	30				

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	49
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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	36
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	46
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	62
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	45
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?

ELA, Math, and Science state scores are below the state average according the the FSA reporting.

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

ELA achievement had a 16% gap and Science had a 21% gap between our school verses the state.

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

For 2020-2021 students switched back and forth between virtual and brick and mortar causing a regression in the learning process. This year students will remain with their class even when quarantined from COVID. Intensive reading will take place this year with teachers being able to ability group students based on level. We have adopted a new reading curriculum that each teacher must follow. Common planning sessions will be held on Tuesdays and Thursday to ensure that grade level teachers are following and collaborating about the curriculum.

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

Math learning gain showed the most improvement. MES was above the state average in 2019.

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

Teacher collaborated and followed the curriculum guides set by the district.

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

MES has added a new ELA and Math coach who assist and guide new teachers. The coaches are holding collaborative planning sessions to assist with curriculum.

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.

Teachers were provided professional development on HMH (new reading curriculum). They will be planning twice a week for the upcoming week for the lessons. Professional development has been set by the district throughout the year.

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

MES has added a Math and ELA coach to the faculty.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus In order for students to become college and career ready they must have the strategies needed in order to advance into the next grade level so that eventually they graduate high school and become productive members of society.

Description and Rationale: By the end of the 2021-22 school year, Memorial Elementary will increase proficiency rate of students to 60% in Reading and Math according to the FSA Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-22 school year, Memorial Elementary will increase proficiency rate of students to 55% according to the 2000 Statewide Science Assessment Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.

Monitoring: By the end of the 2021-22 school year, Memorial Elementary will identify students in the SWD subgroup will obtain a minimum of 41% of the Federal Percent Index.
The STAR Renaissance Reading Progress Monitoring tool will be used to quarterly to assess students individually.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Irby (amanda.irby@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use approved curriculum to support the teaching of ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As a school we must have a curriculum aligned with the state so that students are measured using the same curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Intensive reading block from 7:45-8:45am for all students.
2. Paraprofessionals will push into classes three days a week to support instruction.
3. Teachers will ability group students to provide intensive instruction.
4. Groups will progress monitor using the STAR and Amira learning assessments 6 times a year.
5. Teachers will meet two days a week to discuss standards and plan instruction.

Person Responsible Amanda Irby (amanda.irby@desotoschools.com)

1. Science curriculum has been aligned with the Big Science Ideas.
2. Progress monitor three times a year for 5th grade.
3. STEM Lab will be used to reinforce weekly science standards.
4. We will engage parents in a science night in November 2021.
5. Teachers will be able to check out science carts based on the big idea for the quarter to help reinforce the standards being taught.

Person Responsible Amanda Irby (amanda.irby@desotoschools.com)

1. Students will be monitored through MTSS process.
2. Teachers will track their SWD students STAR reading and math.
3. ESE teachers will collaborate with instructional teachers on lesson plans.
4. Quarterly data meetings will be held to adjust support and learning.
5. SWD students have been grouped in a cohort.

Person Responsible Amanda Irby (amanda.irby@desotoschools.com)

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.

MES reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students. Memorial is ranked #127 out of 1,395. MES falls into a very low category. MES has implemented PBIS for the 2021-2022 school to ensure we continue to rank low.

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.

MES has adopted the PBIS model. MES spent the 2020-21 school year developing the model and is excited to role it out to students this school year. Together we have created expectations for students. The acronym we have select is PAWS (Prepare for success; Act responsibly; Work and play safely; Show respect). Students will have the opportunity to earn PAWS bucks quarterly and will get to redeem their bucks for prizes.

For this current school year, open house will occur on August 9, 2021 . Parents are invited to the classroom to meet teachers, create a rapport with teacher, and received classroom rules and expectations.

Monthly letters will be sent home for each student. These letters will provide important message to parents in regards to the standards taught for the month and any additional information the parents may need.

SAC meeting will be held in person in the media every third Tuesday of the month at 4:30 pm and all parents will be invited to attend.

Teachers will be required to communicate with parents quarterly. Teachers will have a parent log to record all parent communication.

Parent surveys will be sent out during the first week of school.

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

The MES staff will be participating in PBIS this year. This includes all employees. All employees will be sharing the same vision and goals for our students.

MES Parents will be provided opportunities to attend parent nights held on campus this year at MES.

MES teachers will be contacting parents four times a year after open house to provide updates on their students progress.

Each student on campus will have a data binder which will hold all assessments and benchmarks so that they know and can explain how they plan to achieve goals set.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00