

Pasco County Schools

Richey Elementary School



2020-21 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Amy Denney Haskedakes

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Pasco 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

The Richey elementary staff accepts the responsibility to be exemplary in every way and to provide educational opportunities to help each child reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The expectation for Richey Elementary is that ALL students, through collaboration and differentiation, will be successful on the path of college, career and life readiness.

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
Haskedakes, Amy	Principal	The members of the leadership team, including Administration, Instructional Coaches, PLC Facilitators, and members from the Student Support Services Team, work collaboratively to analyze a variety of data in order to inform decisions related to impacting student achievement. While considering the whole child, decisions are made to build capacity with standards aligned instruction and utilizing best practices to improve engagement.
Iarussi, Trisha	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/16/2020, Amy Denney Haskedakes

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	78	107	97	94	116	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	601
Attendance below 90 percent	14	29	20	16	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	3	0	0	0	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

Monday 8/31/2020

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	77	88	108	119	108	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Attendance below 90 percent	10	26	24	25	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	8	10	16	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	6	34	15	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	11	24	23	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	2	11	24	23	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	77	88	108	119	108	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Attendance below 90 percent	10	26	24	25	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	8	10	16	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	6	34	15	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	11	24	23	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	2	11	24	23	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	45%	58%	57%	50%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	58%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	60%	63%	50%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	61%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	50%	51%	52%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	53%	53%	18%	49%	51%

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	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	59%	-19%	58%	-18%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	38%	55%	-17%	56%	-18%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	59%	-18%	62%	-21%
	2018	28%	59%	-31%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	31%	57%	-26%	60%	-29%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	53%	-18%	53%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	52	53	37	53	55	30				
ELL	29	50		30	57	67	8				
BLK	29	47		33	27						
HSP	40	49	56	36	52	62	28				
MUL	52	75		52	46						
WHT	49	49	50	49	55	57	47				
FRL	45	50	57	44	51	58	41				
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	21	29	40	29	35	32	42				
ELL	28	47		26	29						
BLK	29	42		33	46						
HSP	33	45	50	37	40	25	50				
MUL	45	33		39	38						
WHT	49	30	19	48	50	48	48				
FRL	42	36	34	41	45	30	46				
2017 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	23	51	59	29	44	50	4				
ELL	30	46		50	77						
BLK	53	40		39	27						
HSP	42	47	50	51	53	64	10				
MUL	55	60		59	70						
WHT	52	52	56	50	50	46	21				
FRL	48	49	58	50	50	53	18				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	51
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	52
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.

The lowest data component for RES was Science Achievement. Factors that contributed to this were inconsistent instruction in previous grade levels and a need for more intensive tier 1 instruction within 5th grade classrooms. In addition, the Black/African American subgroup performed lower than 41%, performing at 34%.

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

The area of Science Achievement had the greatest decline overall, as well as the most subgroups decreasing from the 17-18 school year to the 18-19 school year. The subgroups that decreased were White, Free and Reduced Lunch, Students with Disabilities, and the Hispanic subgroups. Targeted interventions were implemented for ELA and Math throughout the school year and may have contributed to the decrease in science since the focus was more on reading and math.

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.

Our science achievement was 13% below the state average. Additionally, the overall ELA and Math Achievement were lower than the state average as well with ELA being a 12% gap and math being a 19% gap. Furthermore, the science gap grew from 17-18 school year when compared to the state average from an 8% gap to a 13% gap.

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

Our Lowest 25th percentile in both ELA and Math out performed both the District and the State. This was due to the intensive intervention system put into place by all stakeholders.

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

Based on our EWS historical data, office referrals leading to suspensions and attendance continue to be a concern.

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

1. High Impact Instruction
2. Data Driven Decisions
3. Collaborative Culture

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to High Impact Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We must continue to increase scholar engagement through high quality, standards-based instruction to ensure our scholars are given every opportunity to learn at high levels.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>Increase projected proficiency as measured by MAP Assessment by Spring 2020 to 54%.</p> <p>Increase Rigor in classrooms as measured by the IPG to a 60% overall by the end of the year.</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of IRLA "Emergency" students in K-2 to below 15%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Use a variety of strategies to build background knowledge. Anticipate student needs and plan for instructional supports. Conduct formative assessment/instructional conferences to increase reading and writing proficiency.</p> <p>Hold all students accountable for engaging in the work of the lesson. Engage all students in daily writing instruction.</p> <p>Provide high-quality vocabulary instruction throughout the day.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff will meet regularly in PLCs to analyze NWEA Maps data, common formative assessments, student work samples, and other various data in order to determine next steps for instruction and intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. NWEA small group sessions
2. Training aligned with Taking Action for SLT

Person Responsible Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Other specifically relating to Data Driven Decisions

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There is a need to tightly monitor students in our Lowest 35% due to the increase in students not demonstrating learning gains in Reading and Math.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2020, PLCs will create, implement and monitor instruction in Reading and Mathematics, including Tier 2 and Tier 3, which will increase our proficiency FSA data by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Analyze and respond to data aligned to instruction at the three tiers. Identify essential standards for mathematics, ELA foundational standards and writing, monitor for understanding of the standard, intervene or enrich when necessary. SLT/SIT will analyze subgroup data to further problem-solve for tiered supports. Engage in the problem-solving process using data to monitor SMART goals and the effectiveness of core instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff members will reflect and plan for instruction after analyzing NWEA Maps data, informal and formative assessment data, as well as intervention data. Instructional coaches will work alongside staff to lead coaching efforts.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet monthly, as scheduled 2. Analyze student data 3. Create action plan 4. Admin team will monitor action plan, biweekly 5. Revisit action plan; change as needed 	
Person Responsible	Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Collaborative Culture

Area of Focus	Our 2019-2020 Gallup Employee Engagement survey data decreased from 3.59 to 3.43.
Description and Rationale:	We decreased in Student Hope from 4.18 to 4.09 and also decreased in Student Engagement by 0.10.
Measurable Outcome:	Staff will implement practices of Conscious Discipline, such as Safe Place, Morning Greeting, Classroom Meeting and other connecting activities. Staff will also participate in district-mandated monthly Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training on all Early Release Days for 20-21. Behavior ODRs will decrease from 472 to 250.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Staff will implement practices of Conscious Discipline, such as Safe Place, Morning Greeting, Classroom Meeting and other connecting activities. Staff will also participate in district-mandated monthly Social Emotional Learning (SEL) training on all Early Release Days for 20-21, while integrating social-emotional learning, discipline and self-regulation into daily instruction. Staff will also teach 20 days of SEL lessons at the beginning of the school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We MUST ensure our school is a safe and positive place for students to learn. Our staff need to have an understanding of the trauma our students experience each and every day while maintaining high expectations for their success. When students feel safe, they are free from judgment and insecurity. As a staff we will also work to build a culture for professional and personal growth through regular coaching and feedback cycles with administration and instructional coaches.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Staff will participate in Conscious Discipline (CD) training
2. Staff will create Safe Place in classroom and implement morning greetings and classroom meeting each day
3. CDAT will monitor the implementation of CD
4. Staff will participate in monthly SEL training
5. We will focus on all of these things while maintaining a positive school culture for our staff (per our Gallup data).
6. Build capacity with Trauma informed strategies to develop self-regulation for both adults and students.

Person Responsible Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance will be addressed through the relationships that will be fostered through the use and implementation of Conscious Discipline. Attendance will also be monitored and intervened upon with the Student Support team, SIT and SLT.

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.

This year we are focused on creating a team atmosphere by building up the opportunity to work with not only our own teams, but the entire staff. We will continue to support community events to encourage our stakeholders to participate in school events and support our families.

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: High Impact Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Data Driven Decisions	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Collaborative Culture	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00