Dr N H Jones Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Hensel

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (83%) 2017-18: A (81%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Marion 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

Dr N H Jones Elementary School

1900 SW 5TH ST, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

In an innovative environment, students will excel in basic academics with enhanced learning in STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary, where every child will achieve academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hensel, Rob	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader of the school. He/She works with stakeholders to develop a common vision and mission for the school. He/She guides and works with the leadership team to analyze student data in order to monitor student progress to drive instruction and provide curriculum resources aligned to the Florida standards; develop a program that promotes professional development based on evaluations and feedback in order to retain an effective/ highly effective staff; and build relationships with parents and the community.
Coleman, Lisa	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal supports the principal primarily through his/her expertise in curriculum and analyzing student data to drive decision making for instruction. The assistant principal also supports the teachers by using evaluations and observations to determine staff needs in professional development and instructional support through mentoring, modeling, and coaching.
Kennie, Heath	Dean	The student service manager works with the principal primarily to develop guidelines for proper student conduct and disciplinary policies as well as procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment conducive to learning. He maintains visibility and accessibility on the school campus and at school-related activities and events during work day. He also works together with the school counselor to support students with problem solving and coping effectively to be become productive citizens within our community.
Woelfel, Kelly	School Counselor	The school counselor provides support for social emotional learning; provides experiences for students to explore career development; helps students to problem solve and cope effectively to be become productive citizens within our community. The school counselor also supports students by monitoring attendance concerns.
Basel, Lori-anne	Reading Coach	The reading coach provides expertise and assistance throughout the school by coaching, modeling, and/or mentoring identified staff; uses leading/lagging student data and/or staff surveys to provide professional development opportunities; and/or supports students by modeling instructional strategies.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/11/2022, Robert Hensel

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	121	121	139	135	112	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	733
Attendance below 90 percent	15	3	4	10	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	4	6	15	8	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in ELA	13	25	26	11	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	11	11	17	13	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	16	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	11	13	20	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Monday 7/11/2022

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	127	141	138	121	106	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	26	16	15	19	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	6	2	2	11	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	16	18	19	10	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	16	17	6	17	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	18	15	9	16	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	127	141	138	121	106	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	731
Attendance below 90 percent	26	16	15	19	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	6	2	2	11	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	16	18	19	10	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	16	17	6	17	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	18	15	9	16	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	46%	56%				91%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						78%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						77%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	81%	50%	50%				93%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	83%						81%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						71%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	53%	59%				90%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	91%	44%	47%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	94%	49%	45%	58%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2022					
	2019	90%	45%	45%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-94%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	95%	49%	46%	62%	33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	64%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-95%				
05	2022					
	2019	95%	45%	50%	60%	35%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	90%	44%	46%	53%	37%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	41	40		40							
ELL	60			70							
ASN	87	75		93	97		81				
BLK	54	52	32	61	75	61	50				
HSP	63	57		68	80						
MUL	84	79		94	85						
WHT	89	69	67	90	83	71	94				
FRL	59	59	32	62	73	50	67				

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				40							
ASN	84	80		95	90		100				
BLK	64	61	50	60	61	69	29				
HSP	74			78							
MUL	83			83							
WHT	89	78	82	87	77		88				
FRL	61	50	45	59	61	64	38				

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	70										
ASN	100	78		100	91		100				
BLK	74	71	62	78	66	55	70				
HSP	95	93		100	93						
MUL	83			75							
WHT	96	79	83	96	82	73	94				
FRL	80	78	54	79	72	61	74				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	86
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	80
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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

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

Based on proficiency data in ELA for the 2021-22 school year, we are showing a decreasing trend in ELA proficiency of 4% from 81% to 77%. We are showing a decreasing trend in ELA learning gains of 8% from 74% to 66%. We also showed a decrease of 15% in our ELA bottom quartile learning gains from 64% to 49%. Based on proficiency data in math for the 2021-22 school year, math proficiency maintained at 81% proficiency. Our science proficiency increased by 3% from 78% to 81% for the 2021-22 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

There were deficits in the area of ELA proficiency and learning gains. There were significant deficits in the ELA learning gains in the bottom quartile. We showed a decrease of 15% in our ELA bottom quartile learning gains from 64% to 49% based on ELA scores on the FSA from SY2021 to SY2022.

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

We did not have our tasks aligned to the standards being taught in ELA. We need to plan tasks that are aligned to and at the appropriate rigor for the standards. We then have to monitor and give constructive feedback to align ourselves. Also we need to know who our bottom quartile students are in ELA and differentiate our lessons in order to improve their ELA abilities.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our math learning gains showed the greatest improvement. We increased our math learning gains by 7% from 76% to 83%. Our 5th grade science proficiency also increased by 3% from 78% to 81%.

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

Our math teachers and intervention teacher pulled students in small groups who needed remediation or needed the standard retaught to them. Math teachers utilized IXL and Reflex math to target specific math skills for struggling students. Our 5th grade science teachers attended a hands-on science PD. In turn, they designed science lessons and labs that our 5th grade science students could conduct and use the scientific method.

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

During PLCs, we will plan for acceleration lessons for each standard. This will be part of the differentiation planning: how do we help those students who are not successful and how do we help those students who have mastered the standard?

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

Teachers and staff will need to be trained in differentiation strategies and concepts. Teachers will be trained on how to analyze data gathered from formative assessments. District staff will be utilized to provide professional development on acceleration strategies and ideas to be implemented in our classrooms.

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

Administration will conduct fidelity checks of MTSS groups and tasks aligned to the standards. Teachers and administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs in order to calibrate on task alignment to standards. Teachers will also bring in lessons, resources, and student work samples to PLC meetings in order to work on differentiating their lessons to meet all of our students' needs.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our bottom quartile students are not making significant growth in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Teachers will provide differentiated instruction; therefore, our ELA bottom quartile students will increase their growth by 10% in reading to 59% as based on the FAST state assessments for the 2023 school year.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administration and teachers will monitor our ELA bottom quartile's success using DBMA & FAST data throughout the school year. We will reteach nonproficient skills, tutor, and/or provide extra time during the school day for these students in order for them to show proficiency on their standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Providing student learning strategies and opportunities to practice provides a .62 effect size (Hattie). Students will receive learning benefits and show improvement from differentiated instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Teachers will collaboratively plan twice per week in PLCs. During these meetings, they will develop lessons to meet the needs of our students who are non-proficient on the standards. We will also review data and plan reteach lessons for standards that are not being mastered as measured by DBMAs.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers will be trained in Universal Design for Learning during ESSER pre-planning week. Training will be provided by the ESE department.

Person Responsible	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will receive differentiation training during PLCs and throughout the year.

Person Responsible	Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@marion.k12.fl.us)

During PLCs, teachers will analyze data to create groups in order to reteach standards to mastery as well as accelerate students who have mastered the standard.

Person Responsible	Lisa Coleman (lisa.coleman@marion.k12.fl.us)

District staff will be utilized to provide training on acceleration strategies and ideas in order for teachers to implement them in their classrooms.

Person Responsible	Rob Hensel (robert.hensel@marion.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:
• A description and explanation of the school's curriculum
• Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress
• Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet
• Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact
• Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so
• Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children
• Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different options (online and paper based) of communication for our families such as scheduled meetings, phone calls, emails, ClassDojo/Remind App posts/messaging, Twitter posts, virtual meetings via Zoom/Microsoft Teams, the school's website, teacher web-pages, Skyward Family Access, and our school marquee.

Family and community feedback are requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys, and school wide Improvement Plan surveys.

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

We have many stakeholders who contribute and make an impact to promote a positive school culture and environment here at Dr. N. H. Jones Elementary School.

• Students impact the culture and environment by being engaged in learning.
• Parents make an impact with their partnership with the school to ensure successful student learning. Our Parent Organization is a strong supporter of our students' education.
• Teachers provide the delivery of instruction through the development of engaging and relevant lesson plans and activities/assignments.
• The administrators ensure that the school environment is conducive to learning and are instructional leaders. Instructional leadership is based on data driven decision to support the building capacity of the instructional staff and resources.
• The business partner supports the school by providing funding.
• The community provides volunteer hours and donations of funds and/or supplemental resources