

Wakulla County Schools

Crawfordville 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 28 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Crawfordville Elementary School

379 ARRAN RD, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://ces.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Alena Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | 68% |
| 2020-21 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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (65%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| 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 Wakulla 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Crawfordville Elementary School

379 ARRAN RD, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://ces.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

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 KG-5 | Yes | 67% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 20% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | A | A | A |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Wakulla 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.

Crawfordville Elementary School believes that its mission is to create an atmosphere of warmth, trust, and respect by continuously providing role modeling and helping others understand the importance of such an atmosphere. We will lead students to believe in themselves by using data to show their strengths, data to help them set goals, and data to plan instruction so that students CAN meet their goals. We will know students, take an interest in our students, and appreciate the diversity of our students. Only positive, professional, productive approaches will be used towards parents, students and colleagues in order to establish and maintain the needed teamwork that it takes to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will achieve their highest potential as a result of the experiences that are provided by a team of highly qualified professionals in a positive, caring, healthy and safe learning environment.

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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| Crawford, Alena | Principal | Provide leadership, direction and coordination within the school. Develop and maintain effective educational programs within the school and promote the improvement of teaching and learning with the school. |
| Allen, Amber | School Counselor | Developing, implementing and managing school guidance programs. Working with students in individual, small group and classroom settings. Assisting students with creating an academic plan for their education. Helping students plan for college and a successful career after graduation. |
| Tillman, Susan | Instructional Coach | Professional developer who teach educators how to use proven instructional methods, observe classes, analyze teacher's needs, collaborate on interventions, modeling and observing. |
| Pearce, Rebecca | Teacher, K-12 | Helps teachers use the state standards to plan instruction and assessment. Collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to to analyze students' strengths and target areas for improvement. |
| Henderson, Erin | Teacher, K-12 | Helps teachers use the state standards to plan instruction and assessment. Collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to to analyze students' strengths and target areas for improvement. |
| Lankford, Carrie | Teacher, K-12 | Helps teachers use the state standards to plan instruction and assessment. Collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to to analyze students' strengths and target areas for improvement. |
| Morris, Katelin | Teacher, K-12 | Helps teachers use the state standards to plan instruction and assessment. Collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to to analyze students' strengths and target areas for improvement. |
| Hatfield, Heather | Teacher, K-12 | Helps teachers use the state standards to plan instruction and assessment. Collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to to analyze students' strengths and target areas for improvement. |
| Adkison, Alisa | Teacher, K-12 | Helps teachers use the state standards to plan instruction and assessment. Collaborates and supports teachers in using the curriculum to to analyze students' strengths and target areas for improvement. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Alena Crawford

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.*

2

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

641

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

6

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

11

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 | 111 | 105 | 125 | 93 | 117 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 641 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 26 | 25 | 29 | 19 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 138 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 36 | 56 | 44 | 40 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |

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 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 16 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| 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 8/31/2021

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 | 96 | 133 | 92 | 108 | 86 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 613 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 26 | 15 | 16 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | 96 | 133 | 92 | 108 | 86 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 613 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 21 | 26 | 15 | 16 | 25 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |

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 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 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 | | | | 72% | 68% | 57% | 69% | 64% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 60% | 59% | 58% | 62% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 47% | 53% | 59% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 72% | 68% | 63% | 62% | 64% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 76% | 69% | 62% | 68% | 60% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 59% | 52% | 51% | 63% | 51% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 58% | 56% | 53% | 69% | 64% | 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 | 70% | 67% | 3% | 58% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 66% | 6% | 58% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 71% | 61% | 10% | 56% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 62% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 71% | 8% | 64% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 60% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -79% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 53% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1-5 STAR Reading and STAR Math

K-1 STAR Early Literacy

5 - DSBA Science

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 55/104 -53% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 24/44 - 55% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/11 - 45% | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 79 / 78% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20/44 - 45% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/11 - 45% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 74/124 -60% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33/49 - 67% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/14 - 50% | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0/1 - 0% | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 68/121 -56% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26/49 - 53% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5/14 - 36% | | |
| | English Language Learners | 0/1 - 0% | | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 49/89 - 55% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16/40 - 40% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4/17 - 24% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 44/89 - 49% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15/40 - 38% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/17 - 18% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 79/112 - 71% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27/40 - 68% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/27 - 41% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 62/112 - 55% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22/40 - 55% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11/27 - 41% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 64/86 - 74% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/32 - 38% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7/15 - 47% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 32/86 - 37% | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11/32 - 34% | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 3/15 - 20% | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | NA | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | NA | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | NA | | |
| | English Language Learners | NA | | |
| | | | | |

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 | 50 | 57 | | 46 | 50 | | 36 | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | | | 34 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 90 | | | 70 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | 61 | 63 | 70 | 69 | 53 | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 56 | 51 | 50 | 57 | 51 | 30 | 47 | | | | |
| 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 | 49 | 38 | 27 | 47 | 44 | 40 | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 66 | 67 | 70 | 61 | 79 | 50 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 60 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 74 | 61 | 54 | 75 | 75 | 59 | 59 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| FRL | 64 | 58 | 57 | 64 | 75 | 61 | 50 | | | | |
| 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 | 63 | 65 | 56 | 41 | 41 | 33 | | | | | |
| BLK | 61 | 62 | | 61 | 77 | 67 | | | | | |
| MUL | 54 | | | 46 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 62 | 61 | 63 | 67 | 65 | 75 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 57 | 47 | 49 | 54 | 55 | 62 | | | | |

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 | 57 |
| 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 | 396 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 48 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 43 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 80 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 49 |
| 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?

The achievement for our black student population in ELA increased from 61% proficient in 2018 to 66% proficient in 2019, then there was a significant drop to 52% proficient in 2021. There was a significant decrease in Math achievement from 2018-2021 among our black student population. In 2018 and 2019 61% of our black students were proficient in Math, in 2021 only 34% of our black students were proficient in Math.

The achievement for our Students with Disabilities in ELA also dropped from 63% proficient in 2018, 49% proficient in 2019, and 50% proficient in 2021. Math achievement levels for our Students with Disabilities increased from 41% proficient in 2018 to 47% proficient in 2019, then dropped to 46% proficient in 2021.

The achievement in ELA for our multiracial population jumped from 54% proficient in 2018 to 60% proficient in 2019, then dropped to 40% proficient in 2021. Math achievement for our multiracial population has increased from 46% proficient in 2018, to 60% proficient in 2019, and 60% proficient in 2021.

The achievement in ELA for our white population was 72% proficient in 2018, 74% proficient in 2019, and then a decline to 68% proficient in 2021. Math achievement levels increased from 63% proficient in 2018 to 75% proficient in 2019, and then declined to 70% proficient in 2021.

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

Increased proficiency in Math, Science and ELA. All three subjects showed a significant drop between 2019-2021 testing periods.

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

Lack of instruction due to early school closure is one contributing factor. Increased need for small group instruction in math, hands on experiments in Science, increased exposure to vocabulary in both math and science, and early interventions through a streamlined RTI process. All classes are required to include 90 minute math blocks including math centers, hands on science experiments twice monthly, early exposure to science and math vocabulary, and beginning the RTI process in Kindergarten and including Hagerty/Lalilo as intervention strategies.

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

Fourth grade ELA proficiency increased by 1%. The number of referrals went down from 127 in 2019-20 to 60 in 20-21.

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

Providing incentives for AR reading program, charting progress, providing individual recognition and reflecting on individual goals contributed to the increase in ELA proficiency. Kognito Mental Health

Training for all teachers, Sanford Harmony implemented daily in classrooms, weekly guidance classes, and increased Mental Health counseling through New Horizons and CCYS all contributed to the decrease in office referrals.

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

Increased amount of time spent daily on math instruction, each grade level is incorporating a math fluency incentive program, each grade level is incorporating a reading incentive program, increase science vocabulary throughout all grades, and increase hands on science experiments to be done in the classroom a minimum of twice monthly, In addition, students will be targeted for early intervention and these students will have access to Lalilo (phonics) and Hagerty (phonemic awareness) programs.

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.

Instructional coaches will provide training to K-2 teachers for Lalilo/Hagerty intervention programs, provide professional development for new ELA standards in K-2, and provide support for the new Science DSBA. KAGAN PLA is being offered to teachers monthly. We have a part time Title I remediation teacher to support learning for the lowest quartile.

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

Instructional coaches, Lalilo and Hagerty are programs currently supported by the district. Instructional coaches are being paid for by a grant provided through the district, it is believed that as long as instructional coaches are being shown useful to the district that this grant will be continued. Lalilo and Hagerty are new programs purchased by the district, funding for these programs will be continued as long as these programs show success within the district. The part time Title I remediation teacher has been a position provided to the school in the past, and as long as there is success shown through the use of this teacher, the position will continue.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Overall proficiency in ELA decreased from 72% to 65%.

Measurable Outcome: Achievement will increase in ELA from 65% to 70% on the 2021-22 FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring through STAR Reading will identify areas in need of remediation to bridge student learning gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Staci Welch (staci.welch@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Additional support through Title 1 remediation teacher.
2. ESE teachers pull small groups in K-5 for additional remediation.
2. Research-based programs and interventions for differentiated instruction including: i-Ready, Lalilo, Hagerty and accommodations listed in the student's IEP.
3. KAGAN cooperative learning activities.
4. Departmentalized teaching in 5th grade.
5. Identifying students with learning gaps in ELA and placing them in the RTI process to bridge those gaps as early as Kindergarten.
6. Teacher coaching and collaborative teaming

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. ESE support personnel and Title 1 remediation teacher will provide increased direct instruction. Through the use of small group and one-on-one instruction, these teachers will be able to provide differentiation beyond what these students are provided in the general education classroom.
2. i-Ready is a computer based program that assesses each student's ability and provides individualized instruction at the student's level. As the student takes assessment at the end of each lesson, the program analyzes whether the student needs remediation or if they are able to proceed to the next skill.
3. Kagan trainings will be provided onsite. This is a research-based program that improves instruction and student engagement. Kagan increases achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills, as well as foster collaboration among students and teachers.
4. 5th Grade teachers departmentalize instructions, which allows students to prepare for middle school by attending classes with more than one teacher each day. This also allows teachers to provide instruction in the core subjects they are best at teaching, and allows them to become very comfortable differentiating in those subjects.
5. Identifying students not making adequate progress through the use of the RTI process, allows teachers to provide students with additional resources and help in order to bridge any learning gaps.
6. Teacher coaching and collaborative teaming provides teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers and implement programs known to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Students with disabilities will be pulled out daily for small group and one-on-one instruction by ESE support personnel and Title 1 Remediation teacher. This will be documented through daily logs of

activities that are done with these students. Goals will be monitored weekly by ESE support personnel and Title 1 Remediation teacher to ensure student's success.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Students will participate weekly in i-Ready programs in the general education classroom.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will attend KAGAN PLA monthly workshops. Teachers will document KAGAN structure to be used at least once weekly in lesson plans.

Person Responsible Miranda Bowen (miranda.bowen@wcsb.us)

Tier 2 and Tier 3 students will be using Lalilo computer program in grades K-2 to help with gaps in phonics, sight words and comprehension.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will provide Tier 3 students in grades K-2 with systematic phonemic awareness instruction through Hagerty Phonemic Awareness program.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

5th grade teachers will implement departmentalized teaching allowing for each teacher to focus on two core subject areas and provide the students with quality instruction.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will run weekly reports of Lalilo and IReady, to determine student's progress. Teachers will adjust instruction to bridge any gaps noticed in the reports.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will monitor progress through weekly assessments, STAR reading, IReady and Lalilo reports and will identify any students with gaps and provide targeted instruction to close the gap. Any student not making adequate progress will be moved into the RTI process or moved to the next Tier in the RTI process.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will meet with teacher coaches to review data and discuss strategies that can be used to bridge any gaps.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Math proficiency dropped from 72% to 66%.

Measurable Outcome: Math proficiency will increase from 66% to 70% on the 2021-22 FSA Mathematics assessment.

Monitoring: STAR Math will be administered according to the district's progress monitoring calendar. Teachers will monitor student's progress through the utilization of STAR reports. Areas of need will be targeted and additional instruction will be provided in that area.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. ESE support personnel and Title 1 remediation teacher will provide increased direct instruction. Through the use of small group and one on one instruction, these teachers will be able to provide differentiation beyond what these students are provided in the general education classroom.
2. i-Ready is a computer based program that assesses each student's ability and provides individualized instruction at the student's level. As the student takes assessment at the end of each lesson, the program analyzes whether the student needs remediation or if they are able to proceed to the next skill.
3. Kagan trainings will be provided onsite. This is a research-based program that improves instruction and student engagement. Kagan increases achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills.
4. High Yield Math Routines will be incorporated daily into lesson plans to ensure spiral math review.
5. Math Blocks will be increased to 90 minutes daily and will include center rotations to include teacher table.
6. Identifying students not making adequate progress through the use of the RTI process, allows teachers to provide students with additional resources and help in order to bridge any learning gaps.
7. Teacher coaching and collaborative teaming provides teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers and implement programs known to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. ESE support personnel and Title 1 remediation teacher will provide increased direct instruction. Through the use of small group and one on one instruction, these teachers will be able to provide differentiation beyond what these students are provided in the general education classroom.
2. IReady is a computer based program that assesses each student's ability and provides individualized instruction at the student's level. As the student takes assessment at the end of each lesson, the program analyzes whether the student needs remediation or if they are able to proceed to the next skill.
3. Kagan trainings will be provided onsite. This is a research-based program that improves instruction and student engagement. Kagan increases achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills, as well as foster collaboration among students and teachers.
4. High Yield Math routines provide students with a deeper understanding of mathematical

concepts.

5. Identifying students not making adequate progress through the use of the RTI process, allows teachers to provide students with additional resources and help in order to bridge any learning gaps.

6. Teacher coaching and collaborative teaming provides teachers with the professional development and mentoring they need to become effective teachers and implement programs known to increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Students with disabilities will be pulled out daily for small group and one on one instruction by ESE support personnel and Title 1 Remediation teacher. This will be documented through daily logs of activities that are done with these students. Goals will be monitored weekly by ESE support personnel and Title 1 Remediation teacher to ensure student's success.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Students will participate weekly in i-Ready programs during as part of the general education curriculum.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will attend KAGAN PLA monthly workshops. Teachers will document KAGAN structure to be used at least once weekly in lesson plans.

Person Responsible Miranda Bowen (miranda.bowen@wcsb.us)

High Yield Math Routines will be incorporated into every classroom daily.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Each classroom will have 90 minutes of math instruction incorporating small groups and hands on activities.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will monitor progress through weekly assessments, STAR math, and IReady reports and will identify any students with gaps and provide targeted instruction to close the gap. Any student not making adequate progress will be moved into the RTI process or moved to the next Tier in the RTI process.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will meet with teacher coaches to review data and discuss strategies that can be used to bridge any gaps.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The increase in science proficiency is a high priority for our school because there was a 3% decrease from 18-19 to 20-21 in Science proficiency. We need to make sure that these students have a better understanding of the Science curriculum in order to ensure future success in science achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Science proficiency will increase from 50% to 60% on the 2021-22 NGSSS Science assessment.

Monitoring: Mystery Science and Science DSBA's will be used for progress monitoring. Teachers will provide additional support in small group and through Kagan activities for the students that are not making adequate progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Tomberlin (kelly.tomberlin@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use research-based programs and interventions for differentiated instruction including:

1. Kagan cooperative learning activities
2. Houghton Mifflin Florida Science Materials
3. STEAM projects at minimum of bi-weekly
4. Teacher coaching and collaborative teaming
5. Ongoing progress monitoring through Mystery Science
6. After School Program for Math/Science for students 3-5
7. District Standards Based Assessment - Science

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Teachers will attend KAGAN PLA monthly workshops. Teachers will document KAGAN structure to be used at least once weekly in lesson plans. This increases achievement and engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical thinking skills.
2. Houghton Mifflin Science materials are aligned to Florida standards and include interactive lessons that expose students to authentic science experiments.
3. Teachers will have students conduct STEAM activities in the classroom, which will help students become familiar with the Scientific process and provide hands-on learning.
4. Teacher coaching and collaborative teaming provides teachers with the tools they need to become effective in increasing student achievement.
5. Mystery Science will monitor student's progress in mastering the Science standards.
6. After School programs will provide students additional support outside of the school day to ensure success.
7. District Standards Based Assessments provide teachers with data regarding students' progress towards the mastery of the standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend Kagan professional developments provided by the district. Attendance sheets and ePDC transcripts will serve as evidence of training.

Person Responsible: Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will incorporate bi-weekly STEAM materials as needed. Implementation will be monitored through lesson plans and classroom activities into weekly lesson plans. Teachers can request individual training/walk throughs.

Person Responsible: Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

After school tutoring will take place twice weekly with certified staff members overseeing the activities.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will utilize the Houghton Mifflin materials to introduce and teach Science concepts. Teachers will utilize the Houghton Mifflin assessments to monitor student progress and adjust instruction accordingly.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will use collaborative planning to plan for STEAM activities bi-weekly in their classrooms in each grade level.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will use District Standards Based Assessments to guide instruction, and provide enrichment or remediation as necessary.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Students with Disabilities were 48% proficient overall in 2020-2021. The federal percent of points index for students with disabilities in 2018-2019 was 40% which was below the state's threshold of 41%. The state requires that these students continue to receive the supports that were received prior to the pandemic to ensure success. |
| Measurable Outcome: | Students with disabilities proficiency will maintain 48% proficiency. |
| Monitoring: | Mystery Science, Science and Reading DSBA's, STAR Math, STAR Reading and IReady will be used to monitor student's progress towards mastery of the standards. General Education teachers, Title 1 Teachers, and ESE support personnel will work as a team to provide additional support as needed to ensure success. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | [no one identified] |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional support will be provided for students with disabilities through ESE support personnel and a Title 1 Remediation teacher. Small group instruction is more effective for student achievement, and through the use of the additional personnel, there will be more small group and one on one instruction to increase student success. 2. Teachers will use research based programs and interventions for differentiated instruction including: IReady, Lalilo, Hagerty and any other accommodations listed in the student's IEP. 3. Kagan Cooperative learning activities. The KAGAN coach will model KAGAN structures each month during the Kagan PLA workshops to help ensure each classroom has engagement and effective instruction. 4. Progress monitoring through STAR Reading, STAR Math, IReady, and DSBA's will identify areas in need of remediation. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ESE Support personnel and Title 1 Teacher will provide increased direct instruction. Through the use of small group and one-on-one instruction, these teachers will provide differentiation beyond what these students are provided in the general education classroom. 2. IReady and Lalilo are computer based programs that assesses each student's ability and provides individualized instruction at the student's level. As the student's take assessments at the end of each lesson, the programs analyze whether the student needs remediation or if they are able to proceed to the next level. 3. Kagan trainings will be provided monthly through the KAGAN coach. This is a research based program that improves instruction and student engagement by scaffolding academic and social structures that build critical reading and thinking skills, as well as foster collaboration among students and teachers. 4. Teacher coaches and collaborative teaming provides teachers with the professional development they need to become effective teachers and implement programs known to increase student achievement. 5. STAR Reading and STAR Math have shown a close correlation with FSA scores. Through continuous progress monitoring of student's STAR reading and Math scores, teachers can identify areas of need and provide remediation in these areas. |

Action Steps to Implement

Students with disabilities will be pulled out daily for small group and one on one instruction by ESE support personnel and Title 1 Remediation Teacher. This will be documented through daily logs of activities that are done with these students. Goals will set to ensure student success.

Person Responsible Brittani Williams (brittani.williams@wcsb.us)

Teachers will be provided access to IReady and Lalilo and training will be provided during faculty meetings or by coaches. Teachers will utilize the training to implement these programs in the classroom as stated in the IEP.

Person Responsible Alena Crawford (alena.crawford@wcsb.us)

Teachers will utilize STAR Reading, STAR Math, and DSBA's according to the district's progress monitoring calendar. Teachers will monitor student's progress and will target in areas of need.

Person Responsible Brittani Williams (brittani.williams@wcsb.us)

Teachers will attend monthly KAGAN PLA workshops as needed to ensure KAGAN activities are being implemented in the classroom.

Person Responsible Miranda Bowen (miranda.bowen@wcsb.us)

Grade level teachers/coaches will meet with ESE support personnel and Title 1 Remediation teacher to review student data and discuss student progress. Through collaborative teaming a plan will be developed based on each student's needs.

Person Responsible Brittani Williams (brittani.williams@wcsb.us)

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.

The data in Safeschoolsforalex.org shows a high incident rate on suspensions in the 19-20 school year, however with the implementation of Kognito/Mental Health First Aid/Sanford Harmony/daily guidance programs these numbers decreased in the 20-21 school year.

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.

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.

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

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.

All students are receiving guidance lessons and social / emotional support once a week. Students are also participating daily in Sanford Harmony (a social / emotional program) in the classroom, in order to ensure a positive classroom environment. Students in need of additional services are participating in small group counseling services, provided by an outside corporation.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend regularly scheduled School Advisory Council Meetings held four times per year. During regularly scheduled SAC meetings, parents and families assist with planning, review, and evaluation of the parent and family engagement plans, including the school improvement plan. Parent input is sought, recognized, valued and strongly considered in the decision-making process, including decisions involving Title 1 programs and funding. In addition, parental feedback is solicited via the annual school climate survey , as well as, at each parental involvement activity hosted by the school, including virtual activities.