Monroe County School District

Stanley Switlik Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stanley Switlik Elementary School

3400 OVERSEAS HWY, Marathon, FL 33050

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christine Paul A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

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)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 Monroe 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

Stanley Switlik Elementary School will empower our diverse population of students to attain an educational foundation that enables them to be persistent learners who are prepared for success in college and careers in an ever changing global society.

Provide the school's vision statement

The Stanley Switlik school community fosters individual determination in a learning environment that emphasizes social/emotional well-being and academic goal setting to enable student citizens to act for the betterment of themselves and their community.

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
Paul, Christine	Principal	Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision of all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.
Hendrix, Heather	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Heather Hendrix is the kindergarten chair.
Jimenez, Zulma	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Zulma Jimenez is the first grade chair.
Strama, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Nicole Strama is the second grade chair.
Gonzalez , Stacie	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Stacie Gonzalez is the fourth grade chair.
Meier, Christy	Instructional Coach	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Christy Meier is an at-large member.
Sly, Tanya	Instructional Coach	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Tanya Sly is an at-large member.
Willis, Chris	Guidance Counselor	To advise the BLPT about social/emotional curriculum, student needs, and positive behavior interventions and supports.
Adams, Sarah	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of an elementary school program which meets the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Forgrave, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Taylor Forgrave is the third grade chair.
Wiley, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Shannon Wiley is the specials team chair.
LaFountain, Debra		The Stanley Switlik Elementary leadership team is a peer elected body of colleagues representative of grade levels and departments (ESE & special areas). At-large members are selected by the principal. The role of the building level planning team (BLPT) is to serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision-making processes. Debra Lafountain is the ESE program chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/15/2020, Christine Paul A

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

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)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (50%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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.	

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	60	77	83	77	104	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	11	20	15	14	17	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/17/2020

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	88	96	85	110	82	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	9	13	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	88	96	85	110	82	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
Attendance below 90 percent	9	11	9	13	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	10	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	67%	70%	57%	70%	68%	56%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	47%	55%	58%	58%	58%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	46%	53%	46%	49%	48%
Math Achievement	73%	71%	63%	71%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	66%	64%	62%	67%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	51%	56%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	66%	66%	53%	70%	67%	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	83%	70%	13%	58%	25%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	58%	-3%	58%	-3%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2019	58%	62%	-4%	56%	2%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	60%	7%	64%	3%
	2018	76%	64%	12%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	74%	66%	8%	60%	14%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	60%	60%	0%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	64%	65%	-1%	53%	11%
	2018	65%	64%	1%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	36	29	21	47	64	65	50				
ELL	44	46	45	69	62		60				
HSP	61	47	31	70	66	58	60				
WHT	75	47	27	77	69	64	81				
FRL	61	47	35	69	68	67	60				

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	32	39	35	36	50	38	33				
ELL	64	69		64	74						
HSP	64	56	46	68	70	67	61				
WHT	79	58		78	62	20	85				
FRL	68	57	45	69	67	54	67				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
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	76

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	57
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	
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	63
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	60
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

ELA Lowest Quartile and ELA Learning Gains showed the lowest performance. In the cohort comparison, 4th grade students showed a 20 percentage point decline from their 3rd grade ELA scores and 5th grade students showed a 13 point percentage decline from their 4th grade performance. Trends over the the past few years show a double digit fluctuation in these components. Contributing factors include teacher turnover specifically in 4th grade, interventions delivery, and student engagement.

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

ELA Lowest Quartile learning gains decreased by 17 percentage points. This component broken out by subgroups shows ESE with only 21 percent making gains and WHT with only 27 percent making gains. Contributing factors include teacher turnover in 4th grade, interventions delivery, and student engagement.

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

ELA Lowest Quartile learning gains showed the greatest gap between the school and state average. Contributing factors include teacher turnover specifically in 4th grade, interventions delivery, and student engagement.

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

Math Lowest Quartile learning gains showed the most improvement from 2018. Trends over the past few years show stable, incremental improvements in all three math components. In all three components Switlik has outscored the district and state. 5th grade same grade comparison shows a 14 percentage point gain and only a negative 2 percentage point decline in the cohort. Contributing factors are the inclusion of more standards based instruction, the implementation of learning goals/scales, and small group instruction.

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

Areas of concern are the number of students scoring level 1 on ELA/Math in grade 5. Another area of concern is the number of students with attendance below 90% in grades K-4.

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

1. Improve ELA overall learning gains and lowest quartile.
2. Increase student engagement through SEL curriculum.
3. Improve Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2/3 interventions for students in the ELA lowest quartile.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our ELA learning gains and lowest quartile components, a majority of our students in grades 4 and 5 are not making gains. Improving instructional practices, implementing effective interventions, and fully engaging our students in the learning process will positively impact student learning in these critical grades.
Measureable Outcome:	Our goal for ELA Lowest Quartile is to improve from 29% to 50% of students making gains in this category.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement targeted AVID, evidence-based strategies to enhance standards based instruction throughout the content areas and within our EL and ESE program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The AVID program emphasizes student engagement through self advocacy and high impact instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will participate in the APM progress monitoring.
2. Teachers will participate in targeted AVID school-based professional development.
3. AVID individual goal setting and data chats.
4. Disaggregate data and align supports and interventions.
5. MTSS framework providing Tier 1, 2, & 3 supports throughout the curriculum.

Person Responsible   Christine Paul (christine.paul@keysschools.com)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student attendance and engagement is critical for learning. Research has shown that all students are experiencing more stressors and anxiety as a direct result of the social and academic isolation caused by COVID-19. Happy, healthy, well-adjusted students achieve better outcomes.
Measureable Outcome:	All students will be assessed in October and February through the use of a standardized, universal screener adopted by the district. Students will be grouped based upon the results of the screeners into Tiers 1, 2, and 3 according to the MTSS behavioral framework. Students in Tier 2 and Tier 3 will receive research-based SEL interventions with the intention that they will achieve growth on the February screener.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysstudents.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Second Step curriculum as a Tier 1 strategy. Check In Check Out (CICO), Zones of Regulation, Individual and group counseling, and Strong Start will be some of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies used.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During this challenging time, Stanley Switlik recognizes that students must have their physiological, safety, and well-being needs met before students can focus on learning. SEL curriculum and practices are a proven strategy for improving the learning environment for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. SEL universal screener (October & February).
2. Review SEL data and provide targeted supports.
3. Monitor effectiveness of supports for Tier 2/3 students and modify if needed.

Person Responsible	Sarah Adams (sarah.adams@keysstudents.net)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additional areas of concern include the number of students scoring level 1 on ELA/Math assessments in grade 5 and student attendance in grades K-4. The school leadership team will monitor supports for these students to evaluate interventions and make modifications as needed. The attendance committee will monitor attendance weekly and intervene as necessary. Due to the required attestation form, we expect to see a decrease in overall school attendance however we are developing a menu of resources for students and parents to use at home in order to maintain skills and concepts.

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.

At Stanley Switlik Elementary School we utilize several methods to engage all stakeholders:
1. Virtual Town Halls
2. School Advisory Council/Parent Teacher Organization Meetings
3. Building Level Planning Team
4. Back to School Task Force (District/School)
5. School Newsletter, DOJO, Website, Facebook, & EdConnect
6. Title I Parent Engagement Nights
7. Meet the Teacher & Parent/Teacher Conferences
8. Parent Feedback Surveys

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00