# Chain Of Lakes Middle



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Chain Of Lakes Middle

## 8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

## https://chainoflakesms.ocps.net/

### Demographics

## Principal: Robert Walker

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2014

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | No |
| **2020-21 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 89% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (54%)<br><br>2017-18: C (50%)<br><br>2016-17: B (58%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **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 Orange 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.](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

# Chain Of Lakes Middle

8700 CONROY WINDERMERE RD, Orlando, FL 32835

https://chainoflakesms.ocps.net/

## 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | No | 77% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.**

Our Mission: With the support of families and the community, create enriching and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

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

Our Vision: To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson, Cheron | Principal | As the principal, Mr. Anderson facilitates essential school leadership team efforts to evaluate schoolwide progress towards improvement goals, analyze daily instructional practices, monitor student progress, and develop data-driven action plans to achieve student success. Through routine disaggregation of various data sources, Mr. Anderson provides vision and collaborative protocols for meeting the needs of the teachers and students. |
| Slaughter, Angela | Assistant Principal | As the assistant principal of instruction, Dr. Slaughter plays an integral role in supporting and evaluating school wide programs, analyzing instructional practices and student data trends, and developing plans growth plans. This is accomplished by monitoring and reviewing the implementation and effectiveness of best practice strategies in order to fully utilize the instructional framework and provide teachers and students with the highest level of support for success. Dr. Slaughter also works to ensure that all stakeholders have the opprotunity to play an active role through SAC, PTSA, and various family and community based partnerships. |
| Hurst, Toby | Assistant Principal | As the assistant principal of operations, Mr. Hurst works with the instructional staff to ensure that they are reaching all students through innovative, collaborative, and rigorous lessons. Working with teachers PLC's to help guide teachers to ensure that all subgroups needs are being met academically, socially, and behaviorally. As an active participant in the School Advisory Council, Mr. Hurst works with various stakeholders to help guide the school in decision making. |
| Correa, Allison | ELL Compliance Specialist | As the ELL compliance specialist, Ms. Correa's duty and responsibility on the school's leadership team is to ensure compliance regulations are met in regard to the school's English language learners. This includes ensuring all testing, documentation, and services are provided for these students to be successful. As an instructional leader, Ms. Correa observes daily lessons and provides feedback and coaching assistance to classroom teachers. In addition to ensuring English language learners receive support at school, Ms. Correa assists with translation needs and organizes annual parent meetings. As a valued member of the leadership team, Ms. Correa plays an active role in making school decisions in order to provide an effective, efficient, and safe learning environment. |
| Coleman, Altresse | Curriculum Resource Teacher | As the curriculum resource teacher, Mrs. Coleman-Moore's primary role is to lead teachers in developing best instructional practices using data, make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need, and analyze school-wide trends in instruction. She takes a direct approach as an instructional leader to improve instruction and productivity by working to increase the effectiveness of teachers in all content areas. This includes modeling lessons, supporting teachers in planning instruction, and facilitating professional development. Mrs. Coleman-Moore also leads the school's resource, certification and development program for teachers of all content areas. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Wyatt, Tameka | Staffing Specialist | As the school's staffing specialist, Mrs. Wyatt's role is to work with the faculty to ensure the school is in compliance with the ESE policies and procedures in relation to students with exceptionalities and disabilities. Mrs. Wyatt also works collaboratively with both ESE and general education teachers to ensure all students are academically successful. This is accomplished through ongoing professional learning communities, professional development, and meetings providing the most up to date federal, state and OCPS mandates. |
| Brown, James | Dean | As a dean of students, Mr. Brown assists with the daily operation of the school, specifically in the areas of attendance, behavioral, and disciplinary prevention and intervention services with an emphasis on restorative practices and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). |
| Gregory, Grace | Dean | As a dean of students, Ms. Gregory assists with the daily operation of the school, specifically in the areas of attendance, behavioral, and disciplinary prevention and intervention services with an emphasis on restorative practices and positive behavioral interventions and supports (PBIS). |
| Powell, Kimberly | Other | As the school's SAFE coordinator, Mrs. Powell's job is to promote a safe, orderly, and caring environment. This is accomplished by planning and implementing school wide programs to reduce school violence and engage students in appropriate behaviors and activities that promote character, and facilitate academic growth. As a member of the leadership team Mrs. Powell conducts monthly threat assessment meetings, involves parents and community as the on-site advocate, monitors student behavior, and develops intervention programs for improvement. Mrs. Powell also serves on the school crisis team, as well as the student services team, and facilitates all referrals for mental health counseling services to local agencies. Mrs. Powell routinely assists the administrative team and school resource officer with security concerns; this is accomplished by participating in professional growth opportunities, conducting restorative justice counseling sessions, and effectively managing conflict within the school setting. |
| Stoner, Ashley | School Counselor | As the lead school counselor, Mrs. Stoner collaborates with teachers, parents, and staff, to help students reach their full academic potential. This is accomplished by targeting the social, emotional, and personal needs of the student body, and sharing this expertise with the leadership team through deliberate student scheduling, facilitation of classroom lessons, and the implementation of student recognition programs. Through a partnership with community agencies, school social workers, and school psychologists, Mrs. Stoner ensures access to outside resources that our students may need. As an active member of the leadership team, Mrs. Stoner informs school-based decisions that directly impact the whole child. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Andrews, Kutura | Instructional Coach | As the literacy coach, Mrs. Andrews' primary role is to work with teachers to support best practices in using data, make recommendations about potential next steps to address areas of need, and analyze school-wide trends in ELA and Reading instruction. She takes a direct approach as an instructional leader to improve instruction and productivity by working to increase the effectiveness of ELA and Reading instruction. This includes modeling lessons, supporting teachers in planning instruction, and facilitating professional development. Mrs. Andrews engages stakeholders through the implementation of school and district-wide literacy initiatives. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 6/3/2014, Robert Walker

**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.*

1

**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.*

14

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

57

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

1,146

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

7

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

8

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 | 395 | 357 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1144 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 158 | 113 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 344 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 35 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 86 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 38 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 178 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 52 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 142 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 92 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 270 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 99 | 95 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 264 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 81 | 129 | 145 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 355 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

Monday 8/30/2021

## 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 441 | 386 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1226 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 60 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 72 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 133 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 91 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 102 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 105 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 150 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 360 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 441 | 386 | 399 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1226 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 60 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 175 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 72 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 133 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 59 | 91 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 102 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 105 | 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105 | 150 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 360 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

## 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 | | | | 50% | 52% | 54% | 48% | 52% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 54% | 52% | 54% | 51% | 50% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53% | 45% | 47% | 45% | 42% | 47% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 48% | 55% | 58% | 44% | 53% | 58% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 51% | 55% | 57% | 43% | 51% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 52% | 50% | 51% | 35% | 44% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 48% | 51% | 51% | 49% | 51% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 56% | 67% | 72% | 60% | 68% | 72% |

**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 |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 52% | -3% | 54% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 36% | 48% | -12% | 52% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 54% | -8% | 56% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -36% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 43% | 4% | 55% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 40% | 49% | -9% | 54% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 15% | 36% | -21% | 46% | -31% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -40% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 49% | -8% | 48% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 51% | 66% | -15% | 71% | -20% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 81% | 63% | 18% | 61% | 20% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 95% | 53% | 42% | 57% | 38% |

## 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 tools used to compile additional student achievement data at grade levels 6, 7, and 8 are iReady diagnostics and district-based progress monitoring activities.

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26% | 22% | 28% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 19% | 22% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 2% | 5% | 2% |
| | English Language Learners | 21% | 13% | 21% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20% | 23% | 17% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | 19% | 13% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5% | 10% | 8% |
| | English Language Learners | 10% | 17% | 13% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 25% | 25% | 31% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21% | 22% | 24% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 15% | 18% |
| | English Language Learners | 10% | 15% | 25% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21% | 25% | 31% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20% | 21% | 30% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18% | 15% | 18% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 18% | 28% |
| Civics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26% | 49% | 52% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 42% | 45% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15% | 27% | 21% |
| | English Language Learners | 14% | 41% | 45% |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 41% | 43% | 40% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39% | 41% | 34% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18% | 14% | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 25% | 27% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9% | 14% | 13% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9% | 12% | 12% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 14% | 18% |
| | English Language Learners | 32% | 51% | 48% |
| **Science** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26% | 27% | 36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 23% | 25% | 32% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 9% | 12% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 13% | 25% |

## 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 | 8 | 26 | 34 | 17 | 27 | 23 | 18 | 11 | | | |
| ELL | 20 | 48 | 54 | 29 | 37 | 35 | 17 | 20 | 42 | | |
| ASN | 81 | 80 | | 85 | 46 | | 60 | | 69 | | |
| BLK | 31 | 35 | 33 | 27 | 27 | 28 | 22 | 32 | 44 | | |
| HSP | 38 | 45 | 52 | 44 | 37 | 34 | 38 | 41 | 59 | | |
| MUL | 68 | 48 | | 54 | 40 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 51 | 45 | 66 | 46 | 38 | 57 | 68 | 82 | | |
| FRL | 35 | 38 | 36 | 33 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 33 | 57 | | |
| 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 | 20 | 47 | 40 | 18 | 44 | 47 | 16 | 39 | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 56 | 54 | 42 | 57 | 53 | 31 | 41 | 80 | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 78 | 63 |  | 78 | 56 |  | 70 | 75 | 88 | | |
| BLK | 37 | 48 | 50 | 34 | 42 | 44 | 35 | 45 | 63 | | |
| HSP | 51 | 59 | 53 | 51 | 57 | 55 | 46 | 55 | 78 | | |
| MUL | 63 | 48 |  | 76 | 59 |  |  | 79 |  | | |
| WHT | 67 | 60 | 70 | 66 | 56 | 70 | 70 | 78 | 81 | | |
| FRL | 45 | 53 | 50 | 43 | 48 | 50 | 42 | 53 | 74 | | |
| 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 | 22 | 45 | 38 | 17 | 30 | 29 | 24 | 29 | 40 | | |
| ELL | 25 | 52 | 49 | 29 | 44 | 36 | 26 | 42 | 77 | | |
| ASN | 81 | 57 |  | 77 | 55 |  | 89 | 100 | 78 | | |
| BLK | 37 | 43 | 37 | 27 | 31 | 23 | 32 | 48 | 58 | | |
| HSP | 48 | 53 | 51 | 48 | 49 | 40 | 47 | 58 | 78 | | |
| MUL | 63 | 67 |  | 67 | 62 |  |  |  |  | | |
| WHT | 65 | 60 | 52 | 63 | 53 | 63 | 74 | 77 | 85 | | |
| FRL | 44 | 48 | 43 | 38 | 39 | 30 | 44 | 55 | 73 | | |

## 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 | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 45 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 418 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 93% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 21 |
| 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 | 35 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 70 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 32 |
| 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 | 43 |
| 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 | 53 |
| 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 36 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?**

Analyzing data across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas, the following trends are dominant:

Inadequate Yearly Progress - According to progress monitoring assessments, students demonstrated minimal growth from the Fall to Spring administration of the ELA and Math iReady assessment at all grade levels. However, the 8th grade cohort is performing at a 40% proficiency level in ELA, compared to 6th grade (28%) and 7th grade (31%), which presents an actionable disparity.

Persistent Achievement Gap - According to ESSA data, the Students with Disabilities subgroup did not meet the federal index of 41% (achieving 34%); the Black subgroup is the second-lowest performing at 44%. Additionally, students categorized in the Students with Disabilities and Black subgroups have consistently made the least learning gains in English Language Arts, and demonstrate the lowest Math proficiency. Similar trends for ESSA subgroups are evident in data collected during progress monitoring assessments.

Loss of Literacy in Content Areas - The proficiency of our 7th grade students in Social Studies was 56%, compared to the state's average proficiency of 72%. This is a -16% difference between the school and state proficiency in Social Studies. Likewise, the proficiency of our 7th grade students in English Language Arts was 36%, compared to the state's average proficiency of 52%. This represents an equal -16% difference between the school and state proficiency levels in English Language Arts. This implies a relationship between literacy and content-area achievement.

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

According to available state assessment data, the lowest-performing component was Math achievement. Overall, our students achieved 48% proficiency in Math. Although this is the lowest performing component, the overall Math proficiency of our students increased by 4% compared to the previous year. Yet, there is an emerging trend of our 8th grade students performing the lowest in Math achievement overall. The school's 8th grade cohort achieved 15% proficiency compared to 6th grade (47%) and 7th grade (40%). This is a 1% decrease for the grade level comparison, but a significant 25% decrease for the cohort comparison. Progress monitoring data reflect this trend as well.

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

Contributing factors to the lower performance of 8th grade students in Math were the absence of comprehensive intervention programs, low participation of targeted students in support programs, and inadequate support for culturally responsive instruction and social emotional learning. With the positive overall growth in Math achievement and learning gains, the school leadership team is dedicated to increasing the proficiency for this group of students.

Decreased English Language Arts proficiency levels for students in the 7th grade cohort is a major contributing factor to the school and state gap; additionally, insufficient professional learning community structures and guidance, decreased monitoring of common planning practices, and inadequate support for culturally responsive instruction contributed to the proficiency gap in social Studies achievement.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math. Overall, students in the lowest 25% who achieved learning gains was 52%, compared to 35% the previous year. This 17% increase was one of the highest in the district for this data component.

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

Contributing factors were an increased focus on three major factors: providing empowering environments, accelerating student performance, and narrowing achievement gaps. The new actions taken in this area were increasing cooperative learning structures during daily instruction, building positive relationships with students, with additional attention to students performing in the bottom quartile, and enabling teachers and staff to access and analyze data to monitor and address the progress of student subgroups. Our work to take our students from the lowest 25% to the rising 25% will continue in a positive direction.

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

We will need to implement the following research-based strategies to accelerate learning: creating an empowering and safe learning environment, planning for high-quality instruction, and monitoring student progress.

**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.**

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, the following professional development opportunities will be provided: (1) social-emotional learning, (2) cooperative learning, (3) culturally responsive instruction, (4) standards-based instruction, (5) best practices in exceptional student education.

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

Through weekly professional learning community (PLC) meetings and common planning sessions, teachers will analyze student performance on common formative and summative assessments, in addition to student performance on progress monitoring assessments. Additionally, instructional focus calendars for each content area will include time for remediation and enrichment. Lastly, students will receive additional support, based on data results, through our intervention and acceleration tutoring. As a result of this collaborative and comprehensive model, teachers and leaders can effectively

monitor student progress and plan data-driven instruction to address student learning needs throughout the school year.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Chain of Lakes Middle School will increase the focus on standards-aligned instruction through literacy skills. According to our ESSA data, the Students with Disabilities subgroup did not meet the federal index of 41% (achieving 34%); the Black subgroup is the second-lowest performing at 44%. Additionally, students categorized as a student with a disability or as Black have consistently made the fewest learning gains in English Language Arts and lowest demonstration of Math proficiency. A deeper review of the data indicated a correlation between literacy and content-area achievement. Therefore, focusing on overcoming the loss in literacy, will support and accelerate student mastery of content-specific complex text and rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. Developing and monitoring students' capacity to utilize literacy strategies will positively impact students' ability to be successful when working with content-specific, complex texts, and rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. Providing professional development will enable teachers to develop rigorous learning opportunities and expose students to more rigorous, standards-aligned tasks. And, implementing deliberate monitoring practices will inform action steps to help ensure student understanding, engagement, and mastery of learning standards. As a result, we will be able to accelerate student performance. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The intended outcome is that students will show measurable performance increases in the classroom and on the Florida Standards Assessments. Specifically, the goal is for students to increase proficiency levels in English Language Arts (58%), Math (54%), Science (56%), Social Studies (64%), Acceleration (85%), learning gains in English Language Arts (62%), and learning gains in Math (59%). Additionally, we intend for all of our ESSA subgroups to meet the federal index of 41%. |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored by classroom walkthroughs to determine the implementation of lesson plans that include literacy strategies and rigorous standards-aligned tasks, results from iReady assessments, and results from progress monitoring activities. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | In an effort to achieve these outcomes, literacy strategies will be used to enable students to comprehend and persevere through complex texts. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Focusing on literacy strategies will enable teachers to increase cognitive and conative engagement of all students through academic discussion to prepare for writing. Teachers will plan and facilitate opportunities for all students to utilize literacy strategies to write with evidence in response to complex texts, across all content areas. Additionally, teachers will open up classroom practice to increase pedagogical expertise in literacy across content areas. Through monitoring and modification of instructional practices based on student evidence and professional learning, we will build students' capacity to independently use literacy strategies to be successful with complex texts and master standards in all content areas. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Identify and implement strategies to sustain high-performing teams by participating in district-wide initiatives to support teachers with using literacy strategies.

**Person Responsible** Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net)

Implement, monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning to support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts. Resource teachers will facilitate professional learning opportunities to support the planning of rigorous, standards - aligned tasks. Resource teachers will develop a plan for rigor and standards alignment of lessons. Resource teachers will also provide professional learning and ongoing support for teachers in monitoring student understanding and mastery of learning standards through the implementation of literacy strategies. Teachers will engage in the evaluation of planned learning tasks for alignment to the rigor of the Florida Standards.

**Person Responsible** Altresse Coleman (altresse.coleman@ocps.net)

Use distributive leadership to progress and sustain collective efficacy and a culture of continuous improvement. The leadership team will develop a structured system for monitoring teacher and student progress. Monitoring for teachers will be differentiated based on need and will be determined during classroom walkthroughs and observations. Monitoring for student mastery will occur through PLC data chats and school-wide progress monitoring tasks.

**Person Responsible** Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net)

| | |
|---|---|
| **#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Chain of Lakes Middle School will build and sustain a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to each other and the content. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the schools needs to:<br><br>Increase Student Engagement: Current data shows that 214 students failed English Language Arts and 244 students failed Math; the student cohort with the most failures are current Grade 7 students, for both content areas. There is potential here to identify and address the needs of students to increase pass rates in both ELA and Math, especially for the 7th grade cohort.<br><br>Provide an Empowering Learning Environment: The data component that has shown the most improvement is learning gains for the lowest 25% in Math. Overall, students in the lowest 25% who achieved learning gains was 52%, compared to 35% the previous year. This 17% increase was one of the highest in the entire school district. Thus, there is potential to build on student and teacher empowerment.<br><br>Narrow the Achievement Gap: According to our ESSA data, the Students with Disabilities subgroup did not meet the federal index of 41% (achieving 34%); the Black subgroup is the second lowest performing at 44%. Additionally, students categorized as a student with a disability or as Black have consistently made the fewest learning gains in English Language Arts and lowest demonstration of Math proficiency. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | There are several specific measurable outcomes the school plans to achieve by focusing on culture and environment. The first outcome is that the number of students failing English Language Arts and Math classes will decrease by at least 60%. The second outcome is that at least 59% of our Gap students achieve learning gains in English Language Arts and at least 58% of our Gap students achieve learning gains in Math. We also intend for at least 41% of our students with disabilities and Black subgroups, to achieve learning gains in English Language Arts and Math. |
| **Monitoring:** | Our school will monitor and measure the impact of professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cheron Anderson (cheron.anderson@ocps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | To address this area of focus, we will employ a teacher-led team to actively lead social and emotional learning on our campus. Through the social-emotional learning leadership team (SELL), we will use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Teachers will develop and implement strategies for facilitating collaborative learning, monitoring student learning, and engaging all students. The leadership team will continuously model proper culturally responsive instruction, monitor for evidence of effective implementation, and provide support to PLCs. |

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Providing structured support and guidance for social-emotional learning will facilitate more effective and inclusive instruction. Active student engagement in social-emotional learning instructional practices, coupled with the effective use of monitoring and collaborative learning strategies, will help the school meet the diverse learning needs of students. In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change.

Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

## Action Steps to Implement

Implement a process to examine the current school climate and culture.

**Person Responsible**   Toby Hurst (toby.hurst@ocps.net)

Implement strategies to cultivate and provide support for social-emotional learning, and how it is connected to instructional strategies.

**Person Responsible**   Toby Hurst (toby.hurst@ocps.net)

Provide opportunities for professional growth and implementation of strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture.

**Person Responsible**   Kimberly Powell (kimberly.powell@ocps.net)

Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

**Person Responsible**   Altresse Coleman (altresse.coleman@ocps.net)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](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.

**According to the most recent Safe Schools for Alex data, Chain of Lakes Middle reported 5.1 incidents per 100 students, compared to the statewide rate of 4.2 incidents per 100 students for the 2019 - 2020 school year. This Incident Rate is considered high on a scale ranging from very low to very high. The incidents of crime, violence and disruptive behaviors have been organized into three categories: violent incidents, property incidents, and drug/public order incidents. Reflecting on the school's data, the primary area of concern to be monitored during the school year is the level of violent incidents. The first area of concern is the level of violent incidents. The school reported 4.06 violent incidents per 100 students, for a total of 50. The majority of these incidents were categorized as fighting, threat or intimidation, or physical attacks.**

**Administrators, faculty, staff, parents, and students will collaborate to create school-wide structures to communicate high expectations and address student discipline concerns. In a continuous effort to equip teachers with strategies in classroom management, social-emotional learning, trauma-informed instruction, and restorative practices, professional development will be provided throughout the school year. Administrative deans will also conduct training for teachers on establishing rules and procedures, and recognizing adherence to rules and procedures. A structured approach will help to minimize classroom distractions, keep students engaged in learning while providing a reflective platform for students to take responsibility for their behavior, and address student needs that will help decrease the number of violent incidents. During the school year, quarterly progress monitoring of student discipline data will be conducted to determine if determine positive change and growth. Based on monitoring results, a committee will meet regularly to adjust policies and procedures based on the needs of the school culture and environment.**

## 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.**

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support

a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for staff and families, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with students, staff, and families, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through school-based and district-wide opportunities focused on building capacity in families to support continuous school improvement and student success. Schools strategically utilize staff to bridge the community and school, connect families with resources, and build a culture for authentic family engagement in school staff.

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

According to the Florida Department of Education, each stakeholder has a specific investment in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school: (1) Students - Personal success throughout school, future opportunity. (2) Parents - Pride, success, and opportunity for the students they care about. (3) School staff - Professional efficacy and job satisfaction. (4) School & district staff - "Adequate yearly progress," meeting accountability expectations. (5) School board - Fulfilling the district's mission, media coverage, accountability. (6) Taxpayers - Getting a good return on their tax "investment" in schools. (7) Business community - Ability to hire graduates with skills needed, community economics. (8) Other community members - Community pride and "livability," real estate values.

Overall school climate, programs, family services, parental skills and leadership, and relationships amongst all stakeholders can all improve as a result of developing and maintaining partnerships. Much of this work can be facilitated through regular and fluid engagement in parenting, communication, volunteering, learning at home, shared decision-making, and collaborative partnerships amongst all stakeholders.

## 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 |
|---|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |