

Duval County Public Schools

Lone Star Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

<http://www.duvalschools.org/lonestar>

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Quarles Gaston R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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)	93%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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 Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

<http://www.duvalschools.org/lonestar>

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	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

It is the mission of Lone Star Elementary School to challenge our students to achieve their goals and dreams.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lighting the fire of learning in every child's mind.

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
Quarles Gaston, Cheryl	Principal	
Link, Rebekkah	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Cheryl Quarles Gaston R

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.*

1

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

386

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

2

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

2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/19/2022

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	67	68	61	76	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	10	23	19	16	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	2	1	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	9	28	25	18	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	16	25	26	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	14	26	20	21	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	67	68	61	76	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	10	23	19	16	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	2	1	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	9	28	25	18	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	16	25	26	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	14	26	20	21	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	60%	50%	56%				61%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						69%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%						60%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	48%	50%				67%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	36%						63%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						38%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	59%	59%				63%	48%	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	51%	51%	0%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	53%	8%
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	24	42		26	33		21				
ELL	58	69		32	46						
ASN	75			58							
BLK	49	63	57	48	35	45	40				
HSP	62	82		50	55		40				
MUL	64			36							
WHT	68	54		57	30		45				
FRL	47	52	52	40	27	30	28				

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	7			37							
ELL	44			40							
ASN	50										
BLK	34	39		42			44				
HSP	61			57							
MUL	55										
WHT	65	52		76			70				
FRL	38	38		48			58				
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	34	58	60	31	44	33	31				
ELL	53	57		53	64						
ASN	58	60		83	80						
BLK	55	69	60	67	64	33	64				
HSP	67	81		57	63						
MUL	74	79		79	79						
WHT	62	66	63	64	55	36	64				
FRL	55	69	63	58	63	43	53				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	36
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	67
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	48
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	58
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	50
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	51
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Proficiency increased in ELA (grades 4 & 5) & in Math (grades 3 & 4). Gains for Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged is below the 50% (percentile).

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

Our data component with the lowest performance was LPQ Math. Science proficiency declined as well. We used our ESSR funding for push-in support for Reading to close the learning gap from the pandemic. However, we did not have sufficient funding to provide push-in support for Math. The district cut the funding for our Science Lab Teacher & the online platform PENDA Program. Therefore, students were unable to receive the same level of Science support as in past years.

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 do not have a Math Coach or District Math Support. Provide funding for a Math Coach or Push-In support for intensive remediation & after-school tutoring. Provide District support so that teachers may remediate or alter instruction to students in a timely manner. Provide funding for a Science Lab Teacher & Online Science Platform (PENDA) for our students.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement on the 2022 state assessments were ELA (learning gains) and ELA (LPQ gains).

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

We utilized our ESSR funding allocated to close the learning gap in Reading. We hired additional push-in support to provide daily remediation to students in need. In addition, we appropriated funds to provide after-school tutoring to targeted students by their classroom teacher throughout the school year. We utilized human capital in order to support students impacted by the Pandemic.

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

Continue to provide push-in support and after-school tutoring for students in Reading. Provide push-in support and after-school tutoring for students in Math. Utilize dollars for Interventionists for both Reading & Math. Allocate dollars for classroom teachers to target students for intensive remediation for after-

school support. Allocate funding to Science to support PENDA since we do not have a Science Lab Teacher.

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.

Weekly common planning with teachers for data chats. Weekly prof. development for teachers to assess understanding of the new reading and math curriculum. Professional Development for teachers to assess their understanding of the new State Benchmarks & Standards. Specific PD from Science Specialist for teachers. Specific Math PD from Specialists for teachers. Specific Training from Acaletics Reps for instruction. Specific Training from PENDA online platform for Science Teachers for classroom instruction.

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

PENDA online Science platform has a proven track record of providing the necessary rigor to ensure students will be prepared for FSA. It supports classroom instruction, and allows students opportunities not provided in the classroom or Lab.

Acaletics Program is still being evaluated based upon FSA scores.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Description of Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area.

Rationale for Area of Focus: Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, Walk-Through etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing at grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with inconsistencies in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards aligned tasks while adhering to the district curriculum guide, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning. Walk-Through data collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed that 50% of teachers were providing grade appropriate standards-aligned tasks.

* By October 2022 - at least 67% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks according to Walk-Through data. By December 2022, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

We need to focus on proficiency in order to increase our school grade to a B:

- *ELA proficiency: increase by 1 percentage point;
- *Math proficiency: increase by 7 percentage points;
- *Science: increase by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Administrators will observe instruction to ensure benchmarks are aligned with the tasks and desired outcomes for students. The Data from District & State aligned assessments will be monitored for progress. Classroom data (supplemental resources) will be monitored monthly for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC):
 Professional Learning Communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work, project-based learning, analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard Dufour's PLC questions

- and will be utilized throughout the following Instructional format:
1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.
 2. 3 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction
 3. 2 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity
 4. Infuse science into all academic courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We are embracing the District's priorities and utilizing information attained from the Monthly Principal & AP meetings to address them at the school level for our students.

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.

1. Realignment of Problem Solving Team with new members, procedures and accountability.
2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, Waterford for K; UFLI Phonics Program for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready 1-2; Freckles 3-5; Achieve 3-5; Benchmark Advance K-5; Houghton Mifflin & Penda for Science; District provided curriculum for Social Studies; Standards-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
3. Reveal Math (K-5); Acaletics (2-5), I-Ready 1-2; Freckles 3-5; Reflex Math (3-5); Push-in support (4-5)
4. Adoption of Interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects)
5. Region Reading Specialist-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
6. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers
7. Reading & Math interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers & math students
8. District Math, & Science, Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.
9. Region Specialist support ELA (3-5); After school tutoring (K-5) for targeted students

Person Responsible

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

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 will use the data from our 5 Essentials Survey. We were in the green (very positive) in every category except one (we were "neutral"). That area was Teacher Collaboration. According to U of Chicago (survey designers), 3 or more areas rated as "strong" (green) means your school is more likely to grow and succeed. She shared the results and we watched a video from DCPS about ways to address/improve the Teacher Collaboration portion. After the video, Mrs. Gaston asked grade level teams to complete a planning sheet with their ideas about ways to address this portion so that we can build it into our SIP. She asked all grade levels to submit this information to her by the end of the day. She also asked all faculty and staff to share any thoughts, ideas or discussions about our SIP and what we need to do in order to improve our school. All ideas have been integrated into our PLC's for the subsequent school year. Most Noteworthy: Teachers would like opportunities to observe their colleagues to gain feedback and offer feedback. Covid has impacted the ability to collaborate for the past 2 years. Therefore, Collaborative Coaching Cycles will be utilized for the upcoming school year.

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

Teachers - using positive discipline, rewarding good behavior
 Students - using strategies used in Calm Classroom and those learned at home and at school
 Parents - support students and teachers' efforts
 Staff - support school efforts to promote positive discipline
 Community - support school beautification projects to enhance the school environment & provide incentives to retain teachers