

Manatee County Public Schools

Virgil Mills Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Virgil Mills Elementary School

7200 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/mills>

Demographics

Principal: Jim Mennes

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Manatee 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Virgil Mills Elementary School

7200 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/mills>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>37%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>36%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

Mills Elementary is a school where staff members value children and make learning a high priority. Students experience a high engagement learning environment where teachers use meaningful content. Students achieve mastery, reason, make judgments, think critically, and acquire and evaluate new information

Provide the school's vision statement.

To implement a student-centered, standards-based, rigorous teaching and learning process that will positively impact all student learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mennes, James	Principal	
Bovoletis, Alik	Assistant Principal	
Hart, Michele	Other	
Rodgers, Suzanne	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/26/2015, Jim Mennes

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.*

8

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

900

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	96	105	126	127	137	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	716
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Thursday 9/9/2021

2020-21 - 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	114	132	140	148	176	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	870
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	3	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	8	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	114	132	140	148	176	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	870
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	3	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	8	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				69%	52%	57%	67%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	57%	58%	58%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	55%	53%	40%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	63%	63%	69%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	68%	62%	58%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	53%	51%	37%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				59%	48%	53%	66%	49%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	70%	51%	19%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	52%	13%	56%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	76%	65%	11%	64%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	60%	5%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	58%	48%	10%	53%	5%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

- 1-2 i-Ready
- 3-5 District Benchmark Assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	46	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	32	45
	Students With Disabilities	18	12	0
	English Language Learners	0	33	33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	50	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	26	55
	Students With Disabilities	13	25	33
	English Language Learners	0	0	33

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	36	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	27	47
	Students With Disabilities	11	13	31
	English Language Learners	0	0	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56	46	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	29	39
	Students With Disabilities	6	25	7
	English Language Learners	0	11	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	72	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	70	75
	Students With Disabilities	11	53	70
	English Language Learners	16	25	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	43	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	31	60
	Students With Disabilities	4	27	50
	English Language Learners	0	8	33

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70	60	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	64	56	60
	Students With Disabilities	51	46	31
	English Language Learners	56	49	53
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	60	59	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	54	76
	Students With Disabilities	43	42	52
	English Language Learners	47	45	39
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66	64	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	63	57
	Students With Disabilities	51	50	41
	English Language Learners	54	55	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70	66	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	64	65	54
	Students With Disabilities	49	50	38
	English Language Learners	58	52	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	53	57	60.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	23	60.1
	Students With Disabilities	18	20	55
	English Language Learners	49	54	54

Subgroup Data Review

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	33	31	30	38	46	36	26				
ELL	36	56	50	42	59	36	29				
ASN	68			79							
BLK	59	31		47	71		42				
HSP	64	53	36	55	66	42	57				
MUL	64	50		85			55				
WHT	68	55	42	75	73	58	65				
FRL	62	52	43	66	69	50	61				
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	37	48	45	42	55	50	27				
ELL	38	50	41	35	50	42	30				
ASN	78	79		83	86						
BLK	57	68	45	52	61	33	59				
HSP	56	57	48	58	52	39	43				
MUL	70	57		70	77		65				
WHT	74	68	43	79	76	63	65				
FRL	55	57	42	59	59	43	45				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	40	30	27	39	30	15				
ELL	35	59	45	40	50	20	46				
ASN	71			71							
BLK	54	54	30	54	51		57				
HSP	49	58	50	54	56	38	30				
MUL	62	54		70	60		67				
WHT	76	59	37	77	59	43	79				
FRL	55	55	38	58	55	35	55				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	74
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

In all grade levels and subject areas there was a trend that ELL students had the lowest achievement levels. ELL students were making gains, but not enough gains to close the grade level gaps. Mat Proficiency increased across all grade levels.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest areas of improvement based on our data are; closing the gap for our ELL students and our ELA learning gains with a focus on the L25.

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

The contributing factors are that many of our ELL students were e-learning for months to over a year, many students started in grades 3-5 speaking little to no English and started after the beginning of the year.

I believe that better aligned resources for ELA tier 2 and 3 instruction is needed and time for training. New actions that would need to be taken are having all students attend in person school, have new

resources and training for tier 2 and 3 along with restructure our data meetings to allow time for more problem solving discussion.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The area the showed the most improvement was the math data and math learning gains.

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

I believe that the contributing factors for the improvement in our math scores were Acalectics.

New action steps will be:

- 1.Acalectics with a deeper understanding
2. Implementing Number Talks
- 3.Discussing Math Data at Data Meetings

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

Strategies to implement accelerated learning will be a differentiated 30 min block everyday, with a focus on small group instruction, SIPPS training, and discussing student data on a monthly basis.

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.

We will be providing SEL training, Number Talks, Acalectics, small group instruction, and ESOL accommodation training.

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

Providing differentiated training based on school and teacher needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA gains was the lowest area based on FSA scores. This area impacts all students, but especially the L25 students, including our subgroups of ELL and SWD. School data from benchmark assessments and i-Ready, reflects that our ELL students are performing lower than non ell students.

Measurable Outcome: Mills Elementary School will improve the ELA L25 learning gains by 10 points, measured by the FSA.

Monitoring: Mills will monitor the L25 ELA learning gains by benchmark assessments, i-ready and tier 2 and 3 data. This data will be discussed at monthly data meetings and ILT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Aliko Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence- based strategy that will be used is " The Next Steps Forward In Guided Reading" by Jan Richardson.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale is to focus on small group targeted reading intervention that is differentiated to meet the needs of all students. This book offers planning and instructional tools to teach guided reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Restructuring Data Meetings
2. Monthly L25 meetings reviewing tier 2/3 monthly, progress, interventions.
3. Small group differentiated instruction using Jan Richard Model.
4. ILT meetings with a focus on L25

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SEL is a critical need to help our student be more successful academically by keeping them learning and growing in the classroom instead of ISS or OSS. We identified this as a need through our ILT and analyzing school discipline data.

Measurable Outcome: We the staff at Virgil Mills Elementary School will provide consistency and fidelity of instruction by collaborating and building relationships to help students succeed.

Monitoring: The area of SEL will be monitored by including the school pledge in the morning announcements, posting student expectations throughout the school, behavior contracts, modeling expected behavior and through discipline data in focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Aliko Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Character strong is a district adopted program with a variety of SEL resources that can be used for all grade levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Character strong is a district adopted program with a variety of SEL resources that can be used for all grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School Wide Pledge (Staff)
- 2.School Wide Behavior Contract (Staff)
3. Morning Announcements, including school promise, Character Strong trait, definition, quote, recognizing students who demonstrated trait. (AP)
4. Student expectations posted through out the school. (SSS)
5. School Wide monthly activity and assemblies (Counselor)
6. Discussing Behavior Data at Data Meetings (AP)

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Mills Elementary School had lower referrals then schools across the state. The area with the most referrals was Defiance and Disrespect. We will be looking at our Tier 1 behavior expectations by creating a school wide pledge, sending home a school wide behavior contract and focusing on SEL.

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.

Mills elementary school builds a positive school culture for students and staff by:

- Character Strong Monthly Students Recognition
- Safety Patrol Positive Shout Outs
- School Promise
- School Wide Behavior Contract
- Teacher's first 10 day positive phone call home
- Sunshine Committee
- PTO
- Monthly teacher Craft
- Bi-Weekly "Paws"itive Practice School Email.
- Runners Club
- Bayside Church Provide Breakfast and volunteering

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

- PTO- Provides teacher lunches, treats, prizes, fundraising, classroom materials, building a track for the school.
- Specials teachers and Counselors- Character Strong Recognition and student meetings
- PE Coaches-Safety Patrol Positive Shout Outs
- ILT-School Promise, School Wide Behavior Contract
- Sunshine Committee-Monthly teacher Craft, treats, games, activities
- AP-Bi-Weekly "Paws"itive Practice School Email.
- Bayside Church- Provide Breakfast and volunteer
- Chick Filet-Run Club Food donation
- Teachers- positive phone call home

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
---	--------	---	--------

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00