Desoto Trail Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Desoto Trail Elementary School

5200 TREDINGTON PARK DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

https://www.leonschools.net/desototrail

Demographics

Principal: Michele Keltner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (70%) 2020-21: (66%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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.

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.

To Challenge Each Student to Blaze a Successful Trail To the Future!

Provide the school's vision statement.

DeSoto Trail Elementary will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities	
Keltner, Michele	Principal		School-wide responsibilities
Keen, Megan	Assistant Principal		School-wide responsibilities
Schubert, David	Instructional Technology		Oversee the technology component of school wide schedules and systems
Watkins, Mary	Reading Coach		Oversee adherence to reading standards and implementation of reading interventions
Dillon, Kelli	Instructional Media		Oversee reading/literacy program
Lambert, Theresa	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and kindergarten team
Saud, Hina	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and first grade team
Whitley, Sharon	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and second grade team
Kolke, Margaret	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and third grade team
Morris, Kim	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and fourth grade team
Whitney, Leslie	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and fifth grade team
Baez, Randy	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and special area team
Bennett, Ashley	Teacher, K-12		Liaison between administration and ESE team

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2007, Michele Keltner

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Total number of students enrolled at the school

658

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	100	97	105	111	123	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	21	17	10	11	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

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

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/6/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	97	107	107	133	102	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	14	17	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	97	107	107	133	102	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	639
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	14	17	18	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	81%			85%			83%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%			74%			68%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%			43%			52%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	77%			78%			83%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%			65%			73%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%			40%			52%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	77%			77%			74%	52%	53%

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	91%	61%	30%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
05	2022					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	79%	66%	13%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	54%	18%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	57	62	69	52	35	17	45				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	48	73		54	60						
HSP	75	69		75	56		45				
MUL	89	70		61	40						
WHT	84	72	70	80	72	55	85				
FRL	62	48	50	61	48	50	59				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	58			58							
BLK	70	45		48	45		36				
HSP	100			96							
MUL	81			69							
WHT	85	77	53	81	65	46	80				
FRL	70			59							

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	64	63		69	67		69				
ASN	93	55		93	91						
BLK	66	65	40	63	52	45	41				
HSP	73			87							
WHT	85	71	61	84	74	50	82				
FRL	70	64	47	68	61	44	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	100
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	59
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	64
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	65
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	74
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across all subjects, our students generally exhibit high achievement. All our student groups could improve their growth rate. Our bottom quartile students have the greatest need to increase their growth rate. Students have the most room for improvement in mathematics.

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

Learning gains in ELA and Math; bottom quartile learning gains.

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

Turnover in the guidance department has resulted in inconsistent implementation of the MTSS process. We need to train new on-campus experts in the MTSS process to ensure that appropriate interventions are provided to students who are struggling in math or reading. This will be accomplished through data chats, progress monitoring, and designating faculty to provide intensive Tier 3 math and reading interventions.

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

ELA proficiency of the lowest quartile showed the most improvement, from 43% proficient to 64% proficient.

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

We implemented student-driven progress monitoring and specifically targeted students who were on the verge of being proficient in ELA (data conferencing and goal setting).

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

Expanding data conferencing and goal setting to focus on math and to target our bottom quartile students; improved MTSS process.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Half day planning with an MTSS expert, common planning, data chats, support from Literacy Coach, support from math and reading interventionists.

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

Continuing common planning, half day planning professional development, review of individual student data, and acquiring resources to meet individual student needs.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	As a whole, our students performed well on the FSA Math assessment and on progress monitoring assessments during 2021-2022 school year. We consistently have a much higher percentage of students proficient on this FSA than the state or district averages. Our lowest quartile, however, makes learning gains at near the same rate as the state average. Our goal is to rise above the state average in this category, as we are in overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who make a learning gain in Math by at least 5%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through data chats and student progress monitoring, and the MTSS process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Use state-provided FAST progress monitoring assessments to provide teachers with data on the areas where students have gaps in understanding of mathematics concepts. Structure instructional time to include small- group instruction during which teachers can differentiate math instruction to fill-in gaps in understanding by individualizing instruction. For students who perform below the 10th percentile, or are recommended by their teacher, provide intensive Tier 3 interventions with math interventionist.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teachers and our math interventionist will use robust, evidence-based interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administer FAST math assessments and identify students who fall at the Tier 2 or Tier 3 level

Person Responsible   Megan Keen (keenm@leonschools.net)

Implement Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions with students

Person Responsible   Elizabeth McMahon (mcmahone@leonschools.net)

Monitor student progress in response to interventions

Person Responsible   Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	As a whole, our students performed well on the FSA ELA assessment and on progress monitoring assessments during 2021-2022 school year. We consistently have a much higher percentage of students proficient on this FSA than the state or district averages. Our lowest quartile, however, makes learning gains at near the same rate as the state average. Our goal is to rise above the state average in this category, as we are in overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who make a learning gain in Reading by at least 5%
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Through data chats and student progress monitoring, and the MTSS process.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Use state-provided FAST progress monitoring assessments to provide teachers with data on the areas where students have gaps in understanding of mathematics concepts. Structure instructional time to include small- group instruction during which teachers can differentiate reading instruction to fill-in gaps in understanding by individualizing instruction. For students who perform below the 10th percentile, or are recommended by their teacher, provide intensive Tier 3 interventions with reading interventionist.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teachers and our reading interventionist will use robust, evidence-based interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Administer FAST reading assessments and identify students who fall at the Tier 2 or Tier 3 level

| **Person Responsible** | Megan Keen (keenm@leonschools.net) |

Implement Tier 2 or Tier 3 interventions with students

| **Person Responsible** | Teri Hagen (hagent@leonschools.net) |

Monitor student progress in response to interventions

| **Person Responsible** | Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net) |

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Our teachers need professional development related to intervention programs and data analysis in order to target individual student needs and how to meet them so that all students can make a learning gain. This includes reviewing the MTSS process and how it is implemented at our school site.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	To increase the percentage of all students who make a learning gain in ELA and Math by 5%
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Review of FAST Progress Monitoring assessment data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Provide professional development and collaborative planning opportunities to teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Professional development meets the need for teacher training.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create a Professional Learning Plan for providing training to teachers

Person Responsible	David Schubert (schubertd@leonschools.net)

Teachers participate in training and follow-up activities

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school meets the varying social-emotional needs of its individual students through a variety of programs and services. The Mentoring program pairs community volunteers with at- risk students who need encouragement, academic skills practice, or an adult they can trust and talk to. The guidance counselors hold mini-sessions to help small groups of students process emotions such as anger or grief. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) team brings together the school psychologist, social workers, behavioral specialists, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders to identify the social, emotional, and academic needs of students and pair them with appropriate interventions and other pupil services.

We are proud of how we support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.
•All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and feeder schools. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.
•The school asks parents to complete the Pre-K Readiness Checklist as required by the district.
•The school provides tours to families of students entering the elementary program.
•Fifth graders are invited to a Curriculum Night at Montford Middle School in May to ease their transition to sixth grade. The Montford Middle School guidance team also comes to the school each spring to meet with fifth grade students and answer their questions about transitioning to middle school.
•The school sends representatives to the Northeast Articulation Team (NEAT), the feeder pattern articulation committee, to inform students and families about school events and to motivate students to build a commitment to learning at all school levels.

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

We are proud of how we build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of our students.
•Parental involvement opportunities exist throughout the school year, including parent/ teacher conferences, classroom volunteers, PTO meetings, Science Olympiad, field trips, and fundraisers;
•Curriculum nights inform parents about grade-specific course curriculum and provide answers to any questions parents may have. Further, to encourage parental attendance, the school is offering these informational sessions in the evenings;
•Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators