Cedar Hills Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cedar Hills Elementary School

6534 ISH BRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/cedarhills

Demographics

Principal: Marva Mckinney M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2022

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)	100%
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* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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

Cedar Hills Elementary School

6534 ISH BRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/cedarhills

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	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every school for every student everyday.Cedar Hills Elementary is committed to providing highly quality educational opportunities that will inspire all students to acquire and use the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a global economy and culturally diverse world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or career and life.

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
McKinney, Marva	Principal	Principal (Marva McKinney) provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing interventions and support relating to all programs. The principal ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, RMSE, Corrective Reading and Acaletics. Mrs. McKinney collaborates with the Leadership Team for planning and achieving academic goals for improving the school as a whole. Mrs. McKinney collaborates with the team daily, formal meetings take place once weekly. The Qualtrics Survey is one tool that is used to gather information from the faculty and staff, this information assists with the shared decision making process to determine the scope and sequence of professional development for the school year.
Bylerley-Ray, Megan	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Megan Ray is responsible for articulating a clear instructional vision alongside the principal with a school-wide focus on teaching and learning that is data driven and rooted in the belief that all students can achieve at high levels. Megan Ray, with the principal, and the Leadership Team is responsible for implementing consistent school-wide instructional practices that are clear, results oriented and research-based. Megan Ray is instrumental in creating opportunities for ongoing learning and staff development that is informed by data. Megan Ray and the Leadership Team weekly and complete weekly calibration walks utilizing the Standard Walkthrough Tool.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/22/2022, Marva Mckinney M

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.*
15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
28

Total number of students enrolled at the school
455

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	72	67	74	88	70	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	43	40	34	43	35	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	235
One or more suspensions	4	3	4	10	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	27	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	25	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	17	6	31	56	53	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	223

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	1	1	1	14	32	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	1	1	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/22/2022

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	59	62	78	80	87	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Attendance below 90 percent	4	40	44	54	68	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	45	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	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	3	2	5	37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	2	7	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	59	62	78	80	87	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	438
Attendance below 90 percent	4	40	44	54	68	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	243
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	1	2	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	45	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	36	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	7	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	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	3	2	5	37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	2	7	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	28%	50%	56%				26%	50%	57%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	59%						41%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						49%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	38%	48%	50%				42%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						51%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	59%	59%				31%	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	28%	51%	-23%	58%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	27%	52%	-25%	58%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2022					
	2019	28%	50%	-22%	56%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

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	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	64%	-20%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	32%	49%	-17%	53%	-21%
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	10	35	36	7	25	27	18				
ELL	15	55		27	58		25				
ASN	44	64		56	64						
BLK	24	56	54	32	58	58	36				
HSP	30	72		33	72		40				
MUL	43	64		64	82						
WHT	28	55		45	61		33				
FRL	27	56	57	36	61	56	38				
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	4	20		13							
ELL	32			56							
ASN	60			73							
BLK	16	32	36	22	13	14	9				
HSP	27			27							
MUL	17			33							
WHT	35	40		40	33		38				
FRL	21	32	42	26	24	17	22				
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	6	26	35	21	25	20	8				
ELL	21	18		21	27						
BLK	18	44	50	36	54	52	22				
HSP	19	29		35	38						
WHT	41	43		58	51		60				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
FRL	25	44	49	39	48	44	30				

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	25
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	57
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	45
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	44
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	63
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	44
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	44
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?

The lower area of performance is Reading proficiency with 28% Some contributing factors include novice teachers, teacher turnover, and a new reading curriculum, and a change in standards for grades 3-5.

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

The lower area of performance was in Reading proficiency and Math proficiency. Some of the contributing factors include novice teachers, teacher turnover, and a new math curriculum, and a change in standards for grades 3-5.

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

The largest gap in performance is Reading. Some of the contributing factors include novice teachers, teacher turnover, and a new reading curriculum. Teachers were trained throughout the school year for RMSE and Corrective Reading

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

*Reading proficiency increased +3 points from 25 to 28
*Reading gains increased +27 points from 36 to 63
*Reading LPQ increased +24 points from 39 to 63
*Math proficiency increased +7 points from 31 to 38
*Math gains increased +36 points from 27 to 63
*Math LPQ increased +46 points from 12 to 58
*Science proficiency increased +18 points from 21 to 39
*School Grade increased from an F to a C with an increase of +23 points from 27 points to 50 points

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

Continued implementation of Corrective Reading and UFLI

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

Continued implementation of Corrective Reading and UFLI

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.

All ELA teachers will be trained in Corrective Reading prior to the start of the school year.

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

Attendance will be closely monitored for all students. Monthy and quarterly incentives will be given to all of the students that are present.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	A focus on Instructional practice is critical since teachers in grades 3-5 will utilize B.E.S.T Standards to instruct students. Title I funds will be utilized to purchase supplemental positions, field experiences for students, additional technology, academic resources, materials, and supplies for classrooms, and professional development and training materials for teachers and staff.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	This specific focus is designed to assist the school to increase in reading proficiency from 26% to 35%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitored through the monitoring and data collection from STAR reading and FAST
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategies that will be used include consistent professional development, data chats, and common planning
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

  ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

NA

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

  ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

  ◦ Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

NA

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

  ◦ Literacy Leadership

  ◦ Literacy Coaching

  ◦ Assessment

  ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

NA

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.

As the 2019 Brian J. Davis Fellow for School Climate & Culture, I am working to develop a shared mission and vision, positive relationships, and community engagement with all our staff, students, parents, and stakeholders. I want to expand these opportunities of utilizing teachers as mentors and including community members such as firemen, policemen and the military, to be able to provide positive experiences. The outcome is to promote a school culture that contributes to social and emotional learning with a focus on diversity and inclusion, empathy and critical thinking, communication, problem solving and peer relationships. This alignment will contribute to an increase in student achievement and a healthy classroom and school environment. The school will reach out to business and the community to build partnerships and discussion. Cedar Hills will do this in a variety of ways which include:
SAC
PTA
Business Partnership Liaison
Utilizing Full Service Schools
Communication with parents through DoJo, Tuesday Folders, monthly newsletters, and agendas
Utilizing Calm Classroom Curriculum
Parent Academy

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

Teachers _____
Students_____
Parents_____
SAC_____
PTA_____