J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

J Michael Conley Elementary School At Southwood

2400 ORANGE AVE E, Tallahassee, FL 32311

https://www.leonschools.net/conley

Demographics

Principal: Jason Koerner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
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 (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
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 Leon 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.](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 work in partnership with the community and parents/families to create a strong foundation that meets the individual needs of students (academics, social and emotional) while maximizing technology and developing leadership skills with emphasis on service, kindness and compassion.

Provide the school's vision statement

Conley School @ SouthWood is a place where students achieve their maximum potential academically, socially, physically, and emotionally.

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
Koerner, Jason	Principal	The principal serves as the instructional leader and engages in collaborative decision making with the school leadership team. Together with the team, he establishes and communicates instructional goals for school success. Additionally, he creates and supports an environment of high expectations for teaching and learning.
Abbott, Christa	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Representative and Speech-Language Pathologists use a wide variety of assessments, materials, and techniques for remediation of skills. They perform and participate in staffings to complete the placement process for Exceptional Student Education/ESE, (i.e., IEPs and develop IEP goals based on the student's present levels of performance). School Improvement Plan duties include consulting with ESE team members and general education teachers to provide additional strategies and interventions to support MTSS and the implementation of IEP/504 accommodations according to State and Federal regulations.
Webb, Sharon	Instructional Coach	The reading/literacy coach will serve as a resource for professional development throughout our school to generate improvement in reading and literacy instruction and student achievement. Additionally, the coach helps to ensure academic decisions are data driven and helps to plan appropriate supports for students and teachers to increase achievement.
Ross, Asia	Teacher, K-12	The teacher has a strong knowledge of the Florida Standards, instructional practices and an intense focus on academic performance. In addition to creating a learning environment that is welcoming and engaging, goals also include continuous progress monitoring, data evaluation and instruction in interventions/enrichment.
Weitzel, Linda	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist fosters a welcoming and flexible environment so that the media center is an essential part of the learning community. Develops and maintains resources appropriate to the curriculum, the learners, and instructional strategies of the school. More specifically the media specialist provides lessons in the use of information/ literacy skills, respect for intellectual property, digital citizenship, the use of print and non-print resources, research techniques, and conducts activities to provide integrated curriculum and technology-rich literacy experiences for all. Additionally, the media specialist establishes procedures for selection, acquisition, circulation, resource sharing of resources in all formats. Most importantly the Media Specialist promotes a love of reading and lifelong learning as a foundational skill for learning, personal growth, and enjoyment.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Ava	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves to support the principal in the development, implementation, supervision and evaluation of a comprehensive school-based program of educational and student services designed to increase student achievement.
Glenn, Kim	Instructional Coach	The Intervention Specialist works along with the Reading Coach to design, execute and assess individualized student plans based on various factors such as student needs and resources. Goals include ensuring academic decisions are data driven and planning appropriate supports for students and teachers to increase achievement. Efforts are also coordinated with the MTSS Team to put proper interventions in place to help students acquire mastery of grade level standards.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/21/2020, Jason Koerner

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
53

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	54%

2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (52%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
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	143	145	122	147	128	151	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	836
Attendance below 90 percent	13	6	7	13	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	2	4	4	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Saturday 8/1/2020

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	113	112	129	126	136	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	739
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	13	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	9	10	9	16	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
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	37	33	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	21	28	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	113	112	129	126	136	123	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	739
Attendance below 90 percent	21	19	13	21	16	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	9	10	9	16	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
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	37	33	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115

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	21	28	30	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	10	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	61%	57%	57%	65%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	47%	53%	38%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	57%	64%	63%	68%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	53%	63%	62%	58%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	45%	51%	30%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	63%	52%	53%	57%	52%	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	61%	61%	0%	58%	3%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	57%	4%	58%	3%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	1%					
Cohort Comparison	-7%					
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison	-5%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	63%	-17%	62%	-16%
	2018	67%	64%	3%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison	-21%					
Cohort Comparison						

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
04	2019	66%	66%	0%	64%	2%
	2018	70%	62%	8%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	57%	61%	-4%	60%	-3%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%
	2018	56%	56%	0%	55%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	30	39	39	32	28	15	41				
ELL	50	53		64	67						
ASN	87	72		94	89		82				
BLK	49	46	33	46	45	16	50				
HSP	67	63		57	59						
MUL	47	58		53	50						
WHT	75	64		68	55	10	74				
FRL	47	44	32	42	42	15	52				

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	36	32	28	43	41	21	50				
ELL	53	67		75	86						
ASN	83	75		89	85		93				
BLK	53	48	27	57	50	28	36				
HSP	67	67		74	75						
MUL	53	55		47	36						
WHT	81	54		82	61		81				
FRL	51	45	41	56	47	24	45				

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	52
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
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	60
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	85
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	41
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	62
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	52
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 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	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 school's data component that showed the lowest performance was Grade 5 ELA achievement. According to the iReady data results, 24% of students performed in the bottom 25th percentile. This was the largest percent of students in the lowest 25th percentile out of grades 3-5.

Factors that contributed to this low performance included low beginning of the year benchmark assessment scores for many students, inadequate differentiation for individual student needs during the learning process, and minimal direct instruction in

the second semester. Additionally, there was an insufficient amount of targeted focus on intense interventions and enrichment services for students. Trends for student achievement on benchmarks were also not used effectively to plan strategies for instruction, address areas of skill deficit for students and support professional development needs for teachers.

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 was Grade 4 ELA achievement. According to the STAR data results, we decreased 24 percentage points. Our 2019 data showed 63% of students at or above a level 3 achievement as compared to only 39% of students at or above a level 3 achievement in 2020.

There were multiple factors that contributed to this decline: insufficient shifts in instructional practices, poor differentiation to meet individual student needs, ineffective use of common planning time to support team collaboration and poor usage of student data for strategy planning.

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

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was difficult to determine.

The factor that contributed to insufficient data in this category was the suspension of the state standardized assessments (FSA) due to the Covid-19 Pandemic.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Grade 3 Math. According to iReady data, we increased 3 percentage points, from 46 percent proficient in 2019 to 49 percent proficient in 2020.

New actions taken in this area that contributed to academic improvement was an increase in focus, support, professional development and programs that provided educational support. Strategic staff development to enhance teacher knowledge in the area of Math and data usage as well as sufficiently scheduled and effectively used time for instruction.

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

Based on our EWS data, areas of concern are students having less than 90% attendance and students having one or more suspensions. The school made significant improvement with decreasing the number of discipline referrals, as well as, the number of out of school suspensions imposed on students. The plan for continued success in both areas is an improved MTSS process for support, increased collaborative planning with parents, implementation of individual student plans supported by the School Social Worker, instruction in character education by the Guidance counselor, and a focus on small group and one-to-one instruction in self-regulation skills and coping strategies for students. The utilization of a school-based Behavior Specialist will also be in place.

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

1. Safe and Healthy Students, Faculty and Staff to include Social and Emotional Support
2. Increased Support, Instruction and Celebrations for Positive Behavior
3. Increased MTSS Referrals and Interventions
4. Increased Support and Rigor for Academic Instruction to include Gifted and Enrichment Opportunities
5. Increased Enrollment for 2021-2022

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2020 iReady and STAR data results showed a decrease in the percentage of students scoring at the proficiency level for successful grade level achievement.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase reading proficiency in Grades 3, 4 and 5 as measured by the 2021 Florida Standards Assessments (FSA).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Koerner (koernerj@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of iReady and close monitoring of the usage and data provided. Monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held to include data analysis and instructional implications for students. ....Use of research-based strategies to retrieve information and improve comprehension on text read to include the use of graphic organizers and direction/guidance from the MTSS team for specific students identified as in need of extra support to meet standards or grade level expectations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The monitoring of program usage and data analysis will lead to discussions, planning and further improvement of instructional practices for teachers. As a result, students will have an enriched environment which will lead to effective classroom engagement and increased learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing discussions about data and its implications for instruction
2. Professional Development on effective usage of data
3. Administrators and coaches will monitor the implementation of curriculum and effective instructional strategies
4. Observations in classrooms with feedback provided by administrative team
5. Provide support through instructional coach and intervention specialist

Person Responsible	Jason Koerner (koernerj@leonschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	An area of focus is to increase the number of Students with Disabilities (SWD) performing at the proficiency level on the 2020-2021 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA and Math. The goal is to increase the percentage above 41%. To help meet this goal, Conley has developed a support system for academic interventions aligned to meet the individual needs of students with disabilities. An intervention plan has been devised to provide targeted support to students. The plan will prescribe interventions to help students acquire academic standards, and ensure they are engaged in both ongoing progress monitoring and annual assessments. This area was identified as a critical need based on subgroup data for students with disabilities that show the percentage of proficiency below 41% in the previous school year. Goals for Students with Disabilities: 1. Ensure targeted interventions are received to meet individual student needs 2. Engage in on-going progress monitoring and ensure participation in Baseline Assessments as well as Annual State Assessments 3. Set individual student goals based on needs and standards Evidence-based action steps will be taken to achieve the goals that include hiring an intervention coach, providing additional support for group size reduction, planning for targeted curriculum for intervention support, providing guidance on differentiation, the use of assessments and instructional rigor as well as conducting observations to provide support and guidance on improvement.
Measureable Outcome:	This area was identified as a critical need based on subgroup data for students with disabilities that show the percentage of proficiency below 41% in the previous school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jason Koerner (koernerj@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The plan will prescribe interventions to help students acquire academic standards, and ensure they are engaged in both ongoing progress monitoring and annual assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based action steps will be taken to achieve the goals that include hiring an intervention coach, providing additional support for group size reduction, planning for targeted curriculum for intervention support, providing guidance on differentiation, the use of assessments and instructional rigor as well as conducting observations to provide support and guidance on improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ongoing discussions about data and its implications for instruction
2. Professional Development on effective usage of data
3. Administrators and coaches will monitor the implementation of curriculum and effective

instructional strategies
4. Observations in classrooms with feedback provided by administrative team
5. Provide support through instructional coach and intervention specialist

Person Responsible   Jason Koerner (koernerj@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining school-wide priorities will be addressed by way of data review, ongoing feedback to determine needs of students/teachers, professional development, monitoring of implementation, and collaboration among teachers/ administrators.

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.

Building a positive school culture and establishing a healthy environment for all stakeholders at Conley Elementary is very important for faculty members, students and school growth. A positive school culture is one main key to our success. We believe in the saying that "If you create a great place to work, great work takes place." The following strategies are used to help build a positive culture at our school:

1. Strong Leadership with an established vision to include clear expectations and priorities
2. Collaboration which involves asking questions and soliciting input from stakeholders
3. Communication
4. Encouragement, Support and Celebrations
5. Relationships

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00