Schmidt Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Schmidt Elementary School

1250 WILLIAMS RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Janet Kelly   Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	85%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

All children will learn.

Provide the school's vision statement

To be anchored in Academic Excellence and Integrity

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
Kelly, Janet	Principal	In an effort to engage in a systematic date-based problem solving process, the school's Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to engage in data-driven decision making for core instruction. The process is outlined below: o Analyze student outcomes and make data-driven decisions: 1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification) 2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification) 3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation) 4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness) o Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance o Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (identify root causes and barriers to success). o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses. o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided. o Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals). o Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention, remediation and/or enrichment support). o Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring. o Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions: 1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth? 2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals? 3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working? 4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them? 5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action? At the end and beginning of each year, schools take an inventory of resource materials, staff and allocation of funds for their building to determine the necessary resource materials and personnel available to meet the needs of their students. The leadership team/PSLT develops a resource map to identify gaps in resources and to ensure resources are available and allocated across the building for use by all grade levels and teachers. To ensure teacher support systems and small group and individual needs are met, the Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT):

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		1. Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks. 3. Review progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. The PSLT meets regularly (e.g., bi-weekly/monthly) The PSLT meeting calendar is structured around the district's assessment calendar to ensure there are opportunities to review assessment outcome data and engage in the problem solving process for appropriate data-driven decisions. The members on the team include administrator(s), guidance counselor(s), school psychologist, ESE specialist, content area coaches/specialists, PLC liaisons, and other school personnel as needed. To build capacity multi-tiered system of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive), the PSLT: • Supports school teams with creating, managing and updating the school's resource maps for academic and non-academic areas. • Ensures the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels and assist teacher teams in identifying evidence-based strategies and materials for intervention delivery. • Coordinates data sorts at the beginning of each year to identify students in need of enrichment, remediation and intervention support at each tier. • Facilitates the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide support to students in need of remediation of core skills. • Determines the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals. • Organizes and support systematic data collection (e.g., universal screenings, formative, ongoing progress monitoring and summative data). • Assists and monitor teacher use of SMART goals for core instruction and intervention groups. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the PSLT) • Strengthen Tier 1 core instruction by: o Implementing evidence-based instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in the SIP) o Supporting PLCs with planning and delivering rigorous core instruction. o Ensuring opportunities for common assessments are provided across each grade level. o Reviewing common assessment data to monitor students Response to Core Instruction. o Monitoring the fidelity of instructional practices.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		ILT members include: Janet Kelly, Principal Jessica Salzer, Assistant Principal Karen Tang, Reading Coach Rebecca Carlton, Math Coach Raiza Sepulveda, Guidance Counselor Claudia Rohr, Pshychologist Cindy Sampson, SSW Angelette Green Lewis, ESE Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/24/2020, Janet Kelly

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.*
3

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	85%
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

	Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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	93	108	100	98	100	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594
Attendance below 90 percent	15	10	16	6	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	21	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	4	11	11	20	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
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

Wednesday 6/24/2020

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	104	95	89	112	96	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	26	12	15	10	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	42	46	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	104	95	89	112	96	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	26	12	15	10	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	42	46	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	5	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	3	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	44%	52%	57%	37%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	55%	58%	42%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	48%	54%	63%	49%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains	55%	57%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	51%	60%	44%	47%
Science Achievement	43%	50%	53%	35%	51%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
	2018	34%	53%	-19%	57%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	42%	54%	-12%	62%	-20%
	2018	49%	55%	-6%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	57%	-6%	64%	-13%
	2018	46%	57%	-11%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	46%	54%	-8%	60%	-14%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	40%	51%	-11%	53%	-13%
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	17	33	35	22	38	47	21				
ELL	40	57	60	43	61	69					
BLK	31	45	41	29	23	23	23				
HSP	41	54	55	48	64	64	39				
WHT	58	54		67	76		67				
FRL	41	53	59	43	53	54	40				

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	15	40	43	16	56	71	9				
ELL	30	47	60	43	57		19				
BLK	25	35	29	37	59	57	29				
HSP	35	46	58	48	57	61	32				
WHT	56	46		66	49		50				
FRL	35	43	45	47	58	61	30				

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	51
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	56

English Language Learners	
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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 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	64
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	50
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

Science achievement was lowest at 43% with ELA achievement at 44%. Math was 48%. There is a deficit in science, ELA and Math as compared to district average. However, there is increase in science from 8 percent, ELA 6 percent and Math declined 1 percent.

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

Math in lowest performance, gains and bottom quartile were our greatest decline in the previous tested year. ELA proficiency in the math context is a contributing factor. With proficiency in ELA of 44% it creates a barrier for math understanding.

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 achievement was 48%, 15 percent points less then the state average of 63%. With proficiency in ELA of 44% it creates a barrier for math understanding.

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

ELA achievement 7% increase, ELA gains 9% increase in bottom quartile in ELA was increased by 9%. Science 8% increase. Standards based collaborative team planning.

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

Attendance and level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Standard based collaborative team planning in ELA, Math and Science
2. Small group instruction in ELA and Math
3. Writing to explain understanding across all academic areas
4. Reading across all content areas
5. PBIS plan to increase attendance and decrease behavior trackers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Review student work to drive standards aligned instruction to maximize learning. Student achievement will increase when all students are engaged in standard-based lessons with rigorous differentiation and clear path to mastery. Lessons are aligned with standards based on student needs through backward planning starting with the assessment. Assessments will include writing to explain student thinking and rubric. Coaching cycles, small groups and integration of technology will be utilized to increase student achievement in ELA, Math and Science. DEMO days will occur utilizing substitutes to cover classroom instruction while teacher view highly effective teaching and attend coaching cycles.
Measureable Outcome:	Student proficiency will increase from 44% to 54% in ELA and 48% to 58% in Math. SWD subgroup currently at 31% and black subgroup currently at 32% proficiency in ELA will both increase to at least 41% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janet Kelly (janet.kelly@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation is the same level of cognitive complexity as the academic standard that identify the skills required to demonstrate mastery of the content through student work samples. The teacher assumes that different learners have needs and proactively plans lessons that provide a variety of learning goals based on standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated instruction is taking multiple approaches to content, process and product based on pre and post assessments. It is a blend of whole-class, group and individual instruction. Using student work to guide the planning of instruction and reteach.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional leader:
1. Knowlege of standards: Coaching will continue monitor through PLC and collaborative planning.
2. Assessments with backward planning: Plan for pre and post assessments with data collection for review in all academic areas.
3. Groups will be identified based on needs and reviewed throughout the lesson Small groups will be formed to build on student needs.
4. Review: Instructional leaders will reassess based on data, student work samples with rubric and collaborative conversations.

Person Responsible	Janet Kelly (janet.kelly@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Positive behavior support	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase of student behavior incidents. We will increase our ELA, Math and Science achievement through positive reinforcements.
Measureable Outcome:	We will decrease our student behavior incidents from 46% to 25%. Increase our attendance rate from 93% to 96%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janet Kelly (janet.kelly@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aims to build effective environments in which positive behavior is more effective than problem behavior. Is a collaborative, assessment-based approach to developing effective interventions for problem behavior. Emphasizes the use of preventative, teaching, an reinforcement-based strategies to achieve meaningful and durable behavior and lifestyle outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive behavior affects student achievement. Students show an increase of instructional understanding when they are able to remain in the classroom and learning without disruption.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher:
1. Unified set of classroom rules
2. Define expectations for behavior in all areas of our school.
3. Rules taught and posted throughout school
4. PBIS incentives to increase student positive behaviors through tracking, rewarding and redeeming.

Student:
1. Knowledge of school expectations
2. Increased positive behavior during instructions
3. Subgroups will be able to have system of check in/out interventions
4. Track and redeem rewards

Person Responsible	Janet Kelly (janet.kelly@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Increase our attendance rate from 93% to 96%. Subgroups will be able to have system of check in/out interventions to encourage daily attendance.

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.

Parents play a crucial role in helping their children be successful in school. When schools and parents work together as partners, students reach even higher levels of success. Whether parents are providing a safe home that encourages learning and appropriate behavior or working with school teachers and administrators on specific learning goals for their child, it's vital for parents to support their child's education.
One of the most effective ways to do that is by using Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports. PBIS is a research-based, school-wide system of discipline based on the belief that appropriate behaviors can be taught. It also works well at home and in the community
When all students are taught the same behaviors and social skills, those principles and values become an important part of school culture. Schools use PBIS to create a system of support that works for all students, an approach – research shows- that improves school climate and increases learning opportunities. But teaching alone does not change or shape behavior.
Schools need to create an environment where new behaviors can be practiced, reinforced, and rewarded, an environment where there are consistent, logical consequences for negative behaviors.

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Positive behavior support	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00