Central Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Central Elementary School

610 SW 5TH AVE, Okeechobee, FL 34974

http://centralelementaryschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Kubit

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 Okeechobee 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

We are committed to creating successful life-long learners in a diverse learning environment by building a strong foundation in student achievement through rigorous data driven instruction, character education, social emotional well-being, and a rich culture of reading.

Provide the school's vision statement

We strive to continue the pledge of putting students first and we continue to commit to build a strong culture of successful life-long learners, through the building of strong relationships. We will focus on safety, student achievement through rigorous and data driven instruction, character education, social-emotional well-being, and building a culture of reading in a diversity rich learning environment. We believe that all students are empowered to achieve success when immersed in a powerful learning community that values a diverse student body and is centered on core values as well as a shared commitment to achieving academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kubit, Cynthia	Principal	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Davis, Morgan	Guidance Counselor	Support SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans implemented at Central Elementary.
Torres, Christie	Assistant Principal	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Aguirre, Angela	SAC Member	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Carroll, Erin	Teacher, ESE	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Medrano, Concepcion	Teacher, K-12	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.
Syples, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Ensure SAC meetings, parent involvement meetings and other schoolwide improvement meetings/initiatives and plans occur and are implemented at Central Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Cynthia Kubit

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.*
0

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.*
0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	5	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	1	17	3	21	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	1	15	7	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	10	0	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/29/2020

Prior Year - 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	15	95	88	81	101	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	8	8	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	18	23	38	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	3	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	8	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - 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	15	95	88	81	101	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	471
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	8	8	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	18	23	38	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	2	3	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	8	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	52%	57%	44%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	54%	58%	48%	47%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	55%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	58%	62%	63%	59%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains	42%	57%	62%	54%	54%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	51%	33%	41%	47%
Science Achievement	37%	44%	53%	55%	54%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
	2018	49%	53%	-4%	57%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	42%	46%	-4%	58%	-16%
	2018	35%	41%	-6%	56%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	42%	50%	-8%	56%	-14%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	66%	66%	0%	62%	4%
	2018	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	60%	-4%	64%	-8%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	45%	56%	-11%	60%	-15%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	61%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	44%	-8%	53%	-17%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	47	54	43	34	40	9				
ELL	34	45	64	53	50	50	28				
BLK	43	76		34	43		18				
HSP	40	49	64	63	48	47	37				
MUL	58			33							
WHT	54	44		63	35	17	50				
FRL	42	51	59	60	41	39	37				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	27	40	56	30	32	25	26				
ELL	27	49	50	45	40	33	46				
BLK	29	31		43	47						
HSP	42	52	59	60	54	30	53				
WHT	52	51	58	64	56	23	60				
FRL	40	48	53	58	52	34	53				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
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	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

Mathematics performance for students in the lowest quartile, as well as our science overall proficiency, showed the lowest performance (at 37 and 36 percent respectively). Yes, this is a year to year trend as mathematics in the lowest quartile lost 20 percentage points in 2018 (53% to 33%) and was increased by only four percent this year. In science there was a loss of 18 percentage points from the prior year and this does not appear to be a year to year trend.

Contributing factors may include inadequate or weak curriculum and resources as well as ELL students and bottom quartile students who lack vocabulary and problem-solving skills. Student engagement, strategic questioning and rigorous instruction needs to be more consistent. Lack of focus on science instruction may also play in part in prior growth percentages.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

Science achievement dropped drastically in comparison to the former year. Science overall proficiency went from 55 percentage points to 36 percent for a loss of 19 percent. Teacher and leadership interviews indicate a lack of focus on Science Achievement and Science Vocabulary compared to the year before. Departmentalizing grade levels may also be a contributing factor as well as lack of uniform curriculum implementation and consistent grade-level standard instruction. ELL and bottom quartile students also tend to struggle with on grade level vocabulary and text.

In ELA, our students with disabilities sub-group also showed a great decline. ELA achievement dropped by 12% while ELA learning gains increased by 7%. ELL and bottom quartile students also tend to struggle with on grade level vocabulary and text.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Math Learning Gains as compared to the state average showed the greatest gap of 20 points. With only 42% of students showing learning gains in mathematics, as compared to the previous year's 54%, we have a very large percentage of students who showed no improvement at all. The trend continues to drop. SWD only had 34% showing math learning gains. Inclusion and instructional paras will continue to push in and work with students in specifically in vocabulary, fluency and comprehension strategies.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement , with a 7 point gain from the State and from the year prior score. This is a trend as Central has scored higher than the state for 2 years in a row. These gains occurred after Walk to Intervention was implemented using Fountas & Pinnell leveled readers. Students are assessed and then participate in a daily 50 minute intervention group using these leveled readers. We have renamed the intervention "PAWS' and are pushing in to assist students in fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

The number of students receiving course failures in ELA and Mathematics continues to be high in grades 3 and 4. Attendance also continues to be an area in need of improvement with a total of 28 students below a 90 percent attendance rate.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. ELA Achievements & Gains (emphasis in SWD &
2. Mathematics Achievement & Gains
3. Science Achievement
4. Attendance Focus (Student & Parent Education)
5. Building a culture and love of reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Student Performance in ELA, Mathematics, and Science with Students with Disabilities Rationale According to state assessment and ESSA subgroup data for Students with Disabilities there is an upward trend in math achievement, math learning gains and math learning gains for the lowest 25%, however, math learning gains are still below the Federal Threshold at 41% with an even larger gap between District and State percentages. ELA achievement went down, while ELA learning gains increased by 7%. In addition, ELA learning gains in the bottom 25 % of students with disabilities went down by 2 percentage points. Science declined by 17 points in students with disabilities.
Measureable Outcome:	Math, ELA and Science will show an increase in student performance with our students with disabilities in the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and Administration will utilize Data Chats & PLCs to identify current levels of achievement using previous FSA Assessment and progress monitoring; such as iReady Diagnostic Assessment Data, benchmark data, Acaletics, Ready Math Assessment Data, Standards Mastery and Performance Matters Science Assessments to form targeted intervention groups focused on closing the achievement gap in grades 3-5 for students with disabilities. PLCs will provide training for effective instructional strategies; such as, classroom management, student engagement, rigorous on grade level instruction and strategic questioning techniques designed to deepen student understanding. Teachers will collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction with inclusion teachers that meets the rigor of the standard. Frequent walk-throughs and observations will confirm the use of best practices in instructional methods as well as increased tier 2 instructional groups of both General Education and ESE Teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to improve Math, ELA and Science gains among our SWD students, Data Chats must occur frequently to progress monitor our targeted intervention groups to assess student growth and gaps. PLCs should result in increased strategic instruction, increased differentiation and rigorous standards-based instruction. Tutorial will first attempt to target SWD and BQ students first, who have the greatest need.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Teachers and Administration will participate in targeted professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs to facilitate strategic use of core & supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction and student practice. Core and supplemental instruction includes: Ready Mathematics and Acaletics, iReady, ReadyGen, Elevate and Study Island.

2. Administration and the reading coach will conduct ongoing informal and formal observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and The Instructional Practice Guide.

3. The leadership team will conduct quarterly formal data chats and bi- weekly informal data chats with teachers to provide feedback and guide PLC direction.

4. Students will maintain a data binder in grades 3-5 will participate in student-led conferences with their parents three times a year.

5. Teachers will maintain a class data binder to be utilized during data chats, and during lesson planning for Tier 2 strategic planning for students in need of differentiation.

Person Responsible Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase Learning Gains in Mathematics for Students in the Bottom Quartile Rationale According to state assessment data there is a downward trend in learning gains among the lowest twenty-five percent in mathematics. There is a significant decrease of bottom quartile students who made learning gains from 2017 to 2019 and a significant gap between bottom quartile student learning gains and the state average for bottom quartile learning gains on the state math assessment.
Measureable Outcome:	Math learning gains among our bottom quartile students will increase from 37% of students making a learning gain to 55% of students making a learning gain in the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and Administration will utilize Data Chats to identify current levels of achievement using previous FSA Assessment and progress monitoring; such as iReady Diagnostic Assessment Data, benchmark data, Acaletics and Ready Math Assessment Data to form targeted intervention groups focused on closing the achievement gap in grades 3-5. PLCs will provide training for effective instruction strategies. Teachers will collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction that meets the rigor of the standard. Frequent walk-throughs and observations will confirm the use of best practices in instructional methods as well as increased tier 2 instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to improve math gains among our bottom quartile students, Data Chats must occur frequently to progress monitor our targeted intervention groups. PLCs should result in increased strategic instruction, increased differentiation and rigorous standards-based instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers and Administration will participate in targeted professional development, collaborative planning and PLCs to facilitate strategic use of core and supplemental curriculum, explicit instruction and student
practice. Core and supplemental instruction includes: Ready Mathematics, Acaletics and Reflex Math.

2. Administration and the reading coach will conduct ongoing informal and formal classroom observations to provide focused feedback and instructional coaching utilizing the district evaluation rubric, and Achieve the Core Instructional Practice Guide.

3. The leadership team will conduct quarterly formal data chats and bi-weekly informal data chats with teachers.

4. Students will maintain a data binder in grades 3-5 will participate in student-led conferences with their parents three times a year.

5. Teachers will maintain a class data binder to be utilized during data chats, and during lesson planning for Tier 2 strategic planning for students in need of differentiation.

Person Responsible   Cynthia Kubit (kubitc@okee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

1. ELA Improvements are ongoing as we continue to implement Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy with SWDs and PAWS Groups for bottom quartile for 50 minutes a day. These groups are fluid and set by the teacher based on ongoing diagnostic assessment data. We are also implementing phonics curriculum in grades K-2 using Blast and Countdown materials.
2. Attendance Initiative targets those students with less than 90% attendance. Mentors are assigned and phone calls are made. Skylert calls go home to notify and express the important role attendance has on academics. Rewards for improving attendance results in things such as an ice-cream party, etc.
3. Building a culture of Reading is also important. Renewed efforts for rewarding AR readers has been implemented. Students are placed on a leader-board, social media recognition, certificates, point clubs and healthy competitions are in place. Family Read Nights allow for parents to receive short professional development opportunities to discover the importance of reading at school and at home. DEAR time has been implemented where all classes at a schoolwide designated time literally "drop everything and read"!

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

As a school we are committed to creating successful life-long learners in a diverse learning environment by building a strong foundation in student achievement through rigorous data driven instruction, character education, social emotional well-being, and a rich culture of reading. To do this, we strive to continue the pledge of putting students first and we continue to commit to build a strong culture of successful life-long learners, through the building of strong relationships. We will focus on safety, student achievement through rigorous and data

driven instruction, character education, social-emotional well-being, and building a culture of reading in a diversity rich learning environment.

As a school culture, we strive to value each and every member of our school. We support each other, we communicate, we value the opinion of others, we trust each other- and we know that is a two way street. From student to teacher, teacher to student, teacher to teacher, administrator to teacher, teacher to administrator, staff to parent, parent to staff, school to stakeholder, and stakeholder to school. We believe in small successes that build and grow to become big and lasting change. We care about one another and take time to greet each other.

We do these things in many ways, but key among them are newsletters (communication is key), social media sharing, SAC, PFEP, school events, staff building, PLCs, Data Chats, Team Leader meets, PD, workshops, building pedagogy, SEL focus, and building a culture that reads and loves it.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

		Part V: Budget	
1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**