

Statement of Assurances

By signing this document, the Local Education Agency certifies that:

1. The School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP) has been developed in consultation with parents, school staff and others in accordance with the requirements of Shared-Decision Making (CR 100.11) to provide a meaningful opportunity for stakeholders to participate in the development of the plan and comment on the plans before they are approved.

2. The School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP) has been formally approved by the school board and will be made widely available through public means, such as posting on the Internet, distribution through the media and distribution through public agencies.

3. The School Comprehensive Education Plan (SCEP) will be implemented no later than the beginning of the first day of regular student attendance.

4. A comprehensive systems approach will be established to recruit, develop, retain and equitably distribute effective teachers and school leaders as part of the implementation of the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) system required by Education law §3012(c) and §3012(d) .

5. Professional development will be provided to teachers and school leaders that will fully support the strategic efforts described within this plan.

6. Meaningful time for collaboration will be used to review and analyze data in order to inform and improve district policies, procedures, and instructional practices.

School Leadership Team

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP TEAM: The SCEP must be developed in consultation with parents, school staff, and others pursuant to §100.11 of Commissioner’s Regulations. Participants who are regularly involved in your district and school improvement initiatives, such as community organizations or institutes of higher education should be included. By signing below, stakeholders ascertain that, although they may not agree with all components of the plan, they have actively participated in the development and revision of the SCEP.

Instructions: List the stakeholders who participated in developing the SCEP as required by Commissioner’s Regulations §100.18. Provide dates and locations of Local Stakeholder meetings. Boxes should be added as necessary.

Meeting Date(s)	Locations(s)	Meeting Date(s)	Location(s)
May 15, 2017	LaSalle Preparatory School (staff)		
June 22, 2017	LaSalle Preparatory School (staff)		
June 26, 2017	LaSalle Preparatory School (staff)		

Name	Title / Organization	Signature
LPS staff	LaSalle Prep	During whole school faculty meeting
	John Briglio	
	Ashley Chambers	
	Jessica Kulbago	
	Anne Mardon	
	Julie McIntyre	
	Giannina Lucantoni	
	James Spanbauer	
	Tina Schultz	

School Information Sheet

School Information Sheet							
Grade Configuration	7-8	Total Student Enrollment	562	% Title I Population	100%	% Attendance Rate	90%
% of Students Eligible for Free Lunch	66%	% of Students Eligible for Reduced-Price	4%	% of Limited English Proficient Students	2%	% of Students with Disabilities	19%

Racial/Ethnic Origin of School Student Population											
% American Indian or Alaska Native	2	% Black or African American	27	% Hispanic or Latino	6	% Asian, Native Hawaiian / Other Pacific Islander	2	% White	56	% Multi-Racial	7

School Personnel							
Years Principal Assigned to School	4	# of Assistant Principals	1	# of Deans	2	# of Counselors / Social Workers	2
% of Teachers with NO Valid Teaching Certificate (Out of Compliance)	0	% of Teachers Teaching Out of Certification Area	0	% Teaching with Fewer than 3 Years of Experience	1	Average # of Teacher Absences	

Overall State Accountability Status							
Priority School	N/A	Focus School Identified by a Focus District	X	SIG 1003(a) Recipient	X	SIG 1003(g) Recipient	N/A
Identification for ELA?	X	Identification for Math?	X	Identification for Science?	N/A	Identification for High School Graduation Rate?	N/A
ELA Performance at Level 3 and Level 4		Math Performance at Level 3 and Level 4		Science Performance at Level 3 and Level 4		Four-Year Graduation Rate (HS Only)	N/A
% of 1st Year Students Who Earned 10+ Credits (HS Only)	N/A	% of 2nd Year Students Who Earned 10+ Credits (HS Only)	N/A	% of 3rd Year Students Who Earned 10+ Credits (HS Only)	N/A	Six-Year Graduation Rate (HS Only)	N/A
Persistently Failing School (per Education Law 211-f)	N/A	Failing School (per Education Law 211-f)	N/A				

School Information Sheet

Did Not Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA			
	American Indian or Alaska Native	X	Black or African American
	Hispanic or Latino		Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
	White	X	Multi-Racial
	Students with Disabilities		Limited English Proficient
X	Economically Disadvantaged		

Did Not Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Mathematics			
	American Indian or Alaska Native	X	Black or African American
	Hispanic or Latino		Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
	White	X	Multi-Racial
	Students with Disabilities		Limited English Proficient
X	Economically Disadvantaged		

Did Not Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in Science			
	American Indian or Alaska Native		Black or African American
	Hispanic or Latino		Asian or Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
	White		Multi-Racial
	Students with Disabilities		Limited English Proficient
	Economically Disadvantaged		

Did Not Meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Effective Annual Measurable Objective	
	Limited English Proficient

SCEP Plan Overview

In this section, the district must describe the development of the plan, the degree to which the previous school year's SCEP was successfully implemented, overall improvement mission or guiding principles at the core of the strategy for executing the mission/guiding principles, the key design elements of the SCEP, and other unique characteristics of the plan (if any), and provide evidence of the district's capacity to effectively oversee and manage the improvement plan.

The SCEP must be made widely available through public means, such as posting on the Internet, by the district. The Overview will serve as the at-a-glance summary of how the district will use various funding sources to improve student achievement. A complete overview will address the following:

1. Rate the degree to which the School achieved the goals identified in the previous year's School Comprehensive Education Plan (Mark with an "X").

- Limited Degree (Fewer than 20% of goals were achieved.)
- Partial Degree (Fewer than 50% of goals were achieved.)
- Moderate Degree (At least 50% of goals were achieved.)
- Major Degree (At least 90% of goals were achieved.)

2. Rate the degree to which the School successfully implemented the activities identified in the previous year's SCEP (Mark with an "X").

- Limited Degree (Fewer than 20% of activities were carried out.)
- Partial Degree (Fewer than 50% of activities were carried out.)
- Moderate Degree (At least 50% of activities were carried out.)
- Major Degree (At least 90% of activities were carried out.)

3. Rate the degree to which the activities identified in the previous year's SCEP impacted academic achievement targets for identified subgroups (Mark with an "X").

- Limited Degree (No identified subgroups improved achievement.)
- Partial Degree (Some of the identified subgroups improved achievement.)
- Moderate Degree (A majority of identified subgroups improved achievement.)
- Major Degree (All identified subgroups improved achievement.)

4. Rate the degree to which the activities identified in the previous year's SCEP increased Parent Engagement (Mark with an "X").

- Limited Degree (There was no increase in the level of Parent Engagement.)
- Partial Degree (There was a minor increase in the level of Parent Engagement.)
- Moderate Degree (There was modest increase in the level of Parent Engagement.)
- Major Degree (There was a significant increase in the level of Parent Engagement.)

5. Rate the degree to which the activities identified in the previous year's SCEP received the funding necessary to achieve the corresponding goals (Mark with an "X").

- Limited Degree (Fewer than 20% of planned activities were funded.)
- Partial Degree (Fewer than 50% of planned activities were funded.)
- Moderate Degree (At least 50% of planned activities were funded.)
- Major Degree (At least 90% of planned activities were funded.)

6. Identify in which Tenet the school made the most growth during the previous year (Mark with an "X").

- Tenet 1: District Leadership and Capacity
- Tenet 2: School Leader Practices and Decisions
- Tenet 3: Curriculum Development and Support
- Tenet 4: Teacher Practices and Decisions
- Tenet 5: Student Social and Emotional Developmental Health
- Tenet 6: Family and Community Engagement

In reflecting on the **PREVIOUS YEAR'S PLAN**:

- Describe the most significant positive impact(s) that resulted from the previous year's plan (may include such examples as specific changes in adult behavior and/or measurable changes in student outcomes).

Utilization of the "Data Analysis Process" (DAP) in Math and ELA.

- Describe all mid-course corrections to the previous year's plan in response to data review and needed adjustment. Include details of current impact and expectations for sustainability moving forward.

Pushed back the utilization of the "walk-through" tool as it was determined that it may be viewed as part of a formal observation which was not the intended use. Tool was utilized in second semester.

In developing the **CURRENT YEAR'S** plan:

- List the highlights of the initiatives described in the current SCEP.

Increased use of identified "Fab 5" instructional practices. Increased parent involvement and student support systems including outside agencies.

- List the identified needs in the school that will be targeted for improvement in this plan.

Increased use of "Learning Targets" to improve instructional practices identified in the SCEP. Increase information shared with staff (instructional/support staff).

- State the mission or guiding principles of the school and describe the relationship between the mission or guiding principles and the identified needs of the school.

We are a school community focused on academic, personal, and civic growth. We feel our SCEP addresses all aspects of this mission.

- List the student academic achievement targets for the identified subgroups in the current plan.

Identified subgroup will meet AYP goal.

- Describe how school structures will drive strategic implementation of the mission/guiding principles.

1. Utilization of our Professional Development during the regular school day (ASP). 2. Utilization of scheduling opportunities to support students' academic and social needs.

- List anticipated barriers that may impact the ability to accomplish the mission or guiding principles and how those barriers will be addressed.

1. Lack of funding to create extended learning time opportunities and support services and interventions. 2. Lack of available staff to implement increased intervention opportunities during the school day. 3. Lack of available substitute coverage.

- Describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to teachers and school leaders and the rationale for each opportunity.

Professional development opportunities will reflect the goals stated in new SCEP and will occur on Superintendent Conference Days and during ASP meetings.


- List all methods of dialogue that school leaders will implement to strengthen relationships with school staff and the community.

Staff: 1. Weekly reports from Student Services Team. 2. Monthly reports with information regarding instructional practices from data gathered during walk-throughs. 3. Ongoing small group meeting with staff. Family: 1. Increased solicitation of parent feedback. 2. Increased use of social media. 3. Explore off-site opportunities to meet with parents.

- List all the ways in which the current plan will be made widely available to the public.

School/District website--hard copy available at school.

- Describe the transition plans to assist preschool children from early childhood programs to the elementary school program (e.g., aligned curriculum, joint PD & parent involvement activities, sharing of records/info, early intervention services, etc.). Applies to elementary schools ONLY.



Re-Identified Focus Schools

(Applicable to schools that were identified as Focus during the 2012-2016 identification period)

Focus Schools that were re-identified on the February 2016 list were required to implement more rigorous interventions focused on the needs identified through their DTSDE reviews. Focus Schools were required to implement at least one ESEA Flexibility Turnaround Principle (e.g., redesign the school day, week, or year; modify the instructional program to ensure it is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards; provide time for collaboration on the use of data) no later than the 2016-17 school year. The SCEP must describe the schools plan for intensive implementation of the selected Turnaround Principle and Districts must complete a school leader checklist for the re-identified Focus School, if the principal has been leader of school for more than two full academic years, in order to determine whether the school leader should be provided additional professional development and/or mentoring or replaced. Below provide an update on the implementation of the selected principle.

More information about the Turnaround Principles can be found at: <https://www.ed.gov/sites/default/files/esea-flexibility-acc.doc>

1. Describe the current stage of implementation of the Turnaround Principle the school chose to begin implementing in 2016-17?

2. Identify the method for evaluating implementation of the Principle and any adjustments that have been made based on the evaluation. Include of the data sources used and trends identified from analysis.

3. How will the school continue to monitor and make adjustments to implementation?