

Orange County Public Schools

# Sand Lake Elementary



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Sand Lake Elementary

8301 BUENA VISTA WOODS BLVD, Orlando, FL 32836

<https://sandlakees.ocps.net/net/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathleen Phillips B**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/17/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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 Orange 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](http://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**

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement**

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

### 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
Phillips, Kathleen	Principal	Principal: ensures the mission and vision of OCPS are enacted daily, serves as the instructional leader and primary source of professional development and monitors distribution of leadership roles Assistant Principal: serves as an instructional leader, oversees facility management and maintains behavioral expectations. In the even there is no Assistant Principal, the Principal assumes and distributes duties and responsibilities.
Munoz, Noemi	Other	Curriculum Compliance Teacher (CCT): facilitates and monitors services for ELLs and organizes Multilingual Parent Leadership Council (MPLC) meetings, serves as MTSS Lead and assists teachers in implementing instructional/ behavioral strategies, monitors the effectiveness of the strategies, holds monthly MTSS team meetings to review student, data and adjusts instruction as needed and facilitates instruction for Tier II and Tier III interventions, Instructional Coach-provide coaching cycles and support for teachers
Lawhorn, Wendy	Instructional Coach	Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and individual meetings as necessary, facilitate instruction for Tier II intervention, monitor implementation of standards-based instruction, coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts and serve as assessment coordinators
Belton, Michele	Other	Hold weekly meetings with Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and individual meetings as necessary, facilitate instruction for Tier II intervention, monitor implementation of standards-based instruction, coach teachers in instructional practices that facilitate the instructional shifts and serve as assessment coordinators
Strack, Chelsea	Other	Staffing Specialist: Schedule meetings for the IEP team members to convene and discuss students. Remain in compliance with initial staffings, annual reviews and reevaluations of students receiving ESE services. Work with teachers and families to best meet students' needs.
Mills, Tara	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor: facilitates individual and group counseling, classroom guidance, Child Safety Matters, Act 4 Change, and Change Starts With Me; serves as Title IX coordinator, Safe Coordinator and McKinney-Vento program coordinator.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 2/17/2020, Kathleen Phillips B

**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.*

2

**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.*

7

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

45

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>

<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	11	91	70	102	97	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	7	17	12	9	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

**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	3	2	16	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	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**

Monday 7/6/2020

**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	76	70	90	81	103	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	9	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

**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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	76	70	90	81	103	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	9	11	12	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	31	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60

**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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

## 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	75%	57%	57%	71%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	58%	58%	64%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	53%	43%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	77%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	71%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	51%	56%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	77%	56%	53%	64%	55%	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	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	55%	11%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	57%	21%	58%	20%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	64%	55%	9%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
03	2019	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	63%	11%	64%	10%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	75%	57%	18%	60%	15%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	53%	15%
	2018	57%	53%	4%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	11	37	33	29	50	52					
ELL	63	62	50	72	66	50	68				
ASN	94	86		91	95						
BLK	66	44		66	61		64				
HSP	67	61	44	73	69	47	66				
WHT	78	70	29	82	77	50	86				
FRL	62	59	44	65	69	49	64				

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	15	23	16	19	41	40	30				
ELL	52	61	47	68	74	64	41				
ASN	88	76		88	89		82				
BLK	38	32		52	32						
HSP	63	57	46	73	70	64	50				

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
WHT	79	76	54	83	79	62	83				
FRL	61	53	40	66	64	54	48				

**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	68
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	64
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	92
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	60
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	63
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	71
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	62
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**

The data component which showed the lowest performance was ELA for the lowest 25th percentile. 2019 scores show 41% learning gains, with 2016-2018 showing 44% and

43%, respectively. Instruction was targeted towards increasing overall proficiency. 2019-20 i-Ready middle of the year data for ELA showed 6% at risk, 53% Tier 2, and 41% Tier 3. i-Ready Middle of the year data for math showed 6% at risk, 59% Tier 2, and 35% Tier 3.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline is math lowest 25 percentile area. In 2018, 56% of this data component showed gains compared to 51% in 2019. Students in this data component were provided less small group targeted instruction than our students receiving acceleration lessons. However due to no state-wide testing occurring for the 2019-2020 school year, possible declines in any component could not be determined.

**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**

There was a -12% gap between the school and the state in the area of ELA Lowest 25 percentile. A factor that contributed to this decrease was putting too much emphasis on increasing our overall student proficiency in the area of ELA.

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

Science is the data component that showed the most improvement with 77% of students scoring a level 3 or above on the FSA. Prior to 2019, between 61% and 64% of students were proficient on the Science FCAT 2.0. There was an increased accountability for all teachers to teach the science standards and follow the scope and sequence. Science bulletin boards with vocabulary and students at work were posted on the first and second floor of the building. For each unit, every class had access to the vocabulary on a ring and students would quiz each other in the mornings before the bell rang. Third through fifth grade students took district common assessments and data was used to plan for re-teaching. In addition two STEM nights were provided for families during the course of the school year.

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

Based upon the most recent EWS data, an area of improvement is attendance and will be addressed by which showed 12% of students had an attendance rate of less than 90%.

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

1. Increasing the number of students making learning gains in the lowest 25 percentile in the areas of reading and math.
2. Increasing the number of ESE students meeting grade level expectations.
3. Increase student achievement and learning gains through the implementation of social emotional learning strategies.
4. Decrease the percent of students attending school less than 90% of the time.
5. Increase the amount of acceleration and enrichment opportunities for all students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	<p>In order to increase student achievement, teachers will plan for and implement strategies relating to social emotional learning (SEL).</p> <p>Research shows the implementation of SEL strategies and programs can lead to increases in skill levels, academic performance, improved social behaviors, lower levels of distress, improved attitudes and fewer conduct problems.</p>
<b>Measureable Outcome:</b>	<p>By June of 2021,41% of students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency in the area of ELA and Math. The percent of students in the lowest 25% data component will increase to 55% in the areas of reading and math.</p>
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	<p>Kathleen Phillips (kathleen.phillips@ocps.net)</p>
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Teachers will receive professional development relating to Social Emotional Learning. Teachers will collaborate, plan for, and implement the strategies in their classrooms and be monitored.</p>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Research supports the direct teaching of skills and strategies relating to Social Emotional Learning both for teachers and students as having a positive correlation on short and long term student success and efficacy.</p>

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. School-based SELL team attend district trainings
  2. School-based team trains school staff
  3. Staff plans for implementation of strategies
  4. Coaches and administration monitor implementation of SEL strategies
- Person Responsible**      Kathleen Phillips (kathleen.phillips@ocps.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

In an effort to decrease the achievement gap, teachers will plan using standards-based lessons, Equitable Classroom Practices and frequent student monitoring in order to adjust instruction to meet the needs of all students.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** In 2018-2019, only 11% of our students with disabilities (SWD) were on grade level in ELA and only 29% scored on level in math. Collaboration with general education teachers, paraprofessionals and support staff is necessary to support students' learning toward measurable outcomes and to facilitate students' social and emotional well-being across all school environments and instructional settings (e.g., co-taught). MOY 2019-2020 data showed an achievement gap still remained for this population.

**Measureable Outcome:** By June 2021, 41% of students with disabilities will demonstrate proficiency in the area of ELA and Math. The percent of students in the lowest 25% data component will increase to 55% in the areas of reading and math.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Wendy Lawhorn (wendy.lawhorn@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teachers will effectively collaborate (e.g., sharing ideas, active listening, questioning, planning, problem solving, negotiating) to develop and adjust instructional and behavior plans based on student data and the coordination of expectations, responsibilities, and resources to maximize student learning. This will be done through common planning, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) process.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The MTSS process allows for the problem-solving cycle to deliberately take place for individual students and subgroups. Common planning and PLCs allow for data to be analyzed in order for various decisions to be made.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Create MTSS, PLC and common planning schedule.
2. Teachers will receive training on various strategies for differentiated instruction to support all learners.
3. Monthly PLC meetings will be held to analyze data and discuss successes/struggles in order to make instructional decisions.

**Person Responsible** Wendy Lawhorn (wendy.lawhorn@ocps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**In order to increase the amount of acceleration and enrichment opportunities for all students, select students in grades 2-5 will receive accelerated lessons in an effort to close the achievement gap.**



## 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.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy and partnerships within the community.

### **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

<b>1</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Social Emotional Learning</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>III.A.</b>	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>