Lake Gibson Senior High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lake Gibson Senior High School

7007 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

www.lgbraves.com

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Vann

Start Date for this Principal: 9/7/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	90%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Polk 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

Lake Gibson Senior High School

7007 SOCRUM LOOP RD N, Lakeland, FL 33809

www.lgbraves.com

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)
High School PK, 9-12	No	72%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	57%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

Lake Gibson High School's mission is to graduate all students to be college and career ready by providing rigorous, student-centered instruction along with a variety of acceleration opportunities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Lake Gibson High School is rooted in communicating clear learning targets that drive rigorous instruction, which will lead to growth in student ownership of 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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Vann, Ryan	Principal	
Deshazor, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Diaz, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Whitaker, Sarah	Instructional Coach	
Fisher, Summer	Assistant Principal	
Jorge, Brent	Dean	Dean of Students Discipline PBIS
Ulch, David	Dean	
Williams, Olivia	Teacher, K-12	Teacher leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/7/2016, Ryan Vann

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.*
1

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
92

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	90%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	565	568	478	381	1992
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	46	27	55	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	43	26	19	138
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	43	10	11	81
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	31	21	98
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	144	113	99	549
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	122	102	71	469

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	11	32	15	10	68

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	12	19	18	7	56
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	33	12	91

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567	498	406	383	1854
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	39	28	29	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	52	35	23	202
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	64	90	45	265
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	130	113	62	492

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	60	41	15	205
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	12	9	62

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	567	498	406	383	1854
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	39	28	29	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	52	35	23	202
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	64	90	45	265
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187	130	113	62	492

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	60	41	15	205
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	12	9	62

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	41%	47%	56%	39%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	46%	51%	39%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	37%	42%	33%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	27%	43%	51%	24%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	45%	48%	29%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	44%	45%	27%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	58%	68%	55%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	60%	61%	73%	53%	60%	70%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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
09	2019	40%	45%	-5%	55%	-15%
	2018	40%	43%	-3%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	37%	42%	-5%	53%	-16%
	2018	39%	42%	-3%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	54%	3%	67%	-10%
2018	52%	59%	-7%	65%	-13%
Compare		5%			

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	57%	1%	70%	-12%
2018	62%	57%	5%	68%	-6%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	50%	-29%	61%	-40%
2018	22%	60%	-38%	62%	-40%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	27%	53%	-26%	57%	-30%
2018	36%	41%	-5%	56%	-20%
Compare		-9%			

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	13	36	32	22	39		36	21		82	19
ELL	10	37	41	19				47		78	57
ASN	71	63		33						90	
BLK	31	42	33	21	31	31	37	49		91	43
HSP	39	45	37	29	40	60	63	63		90	63
MUL	35	38		13	40		64			76	69
WHT	46	48	42	31	33	40	67	62		90	56
FRL	32	41	35	23	34	46	46	52		88	51
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	18	30	20	48	43		34	46		68	32
ELL	13	39	24	25	29		42	26		69	44
ASN	44	36									
BLK	31	36	25	35	30	9	47	55		82	54
HSP	39	45	29	31	32	20	57	63		81	59
MUL	52	38					30			77	70
WHT	45	42	28	43	43	35	61	64		84	63
FRL	35	39	24	35	32	23	51	57		79	58

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	8	28	25	8	21	16	30	16		51	30
ELL	4	25	36	10	36	32	18	36		74	58
ASN	47	47		28	33		64				
BLK	26	34	24	17	24	22	42	35		79	55
HSP	39	35	32	26	33	29	57	56		81	74
MUL	53	50		15	33		50	44		85	9
WHT	45	44	39	27	30	29	59	60		79	69
FRL	33	36	30	20	30	35	50	46		74	62

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
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
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	52
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	48
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	50
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	45
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 SWD subgroup showed the lowest performance in ELA achievement, math achievement, social studies achievement and college and career acceleration. An increased level of instructional support by SWD teachers pushing into core subject areas may increase SWD achievement in these areas.

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

Using quarter 2 data, US History saw the greatest decline (35%-27% achievement) from 2018 to 2019. Our school lost an effective US History teacher (midyear) prior to this assessment.

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.

Math and ELA Achievement had the largest gap between the school and state average (spring 2019). With Math Achievement (23%), the amount of substitutes and new teachers were the greatest contributor to the scores being deficient. Regarding ELA achievement (15%), the SWD and ELL subgroups performed far below the average.

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

Using quarter 2 data, Algebra 1 saw the most improvement (6%-61% achievement) from 2018 to 2019. Our Algebra team increased the frequency of collaborative planning and had more purposeful discussions in PC regarding student achievement data from common assessments.

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

Attendance was a potential area of concern.

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

1. Increase SWD proficiency levels
2. Increase ELL proficiency levels
3. Increase attendance rates
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is to increase SWD proficiency levels. Focusing on this area positively impacts student achievement as a whole as teachers become more aware of highly effective practices in differentiation and support strategies for students on all levels. This focus area was identified as critical based on the state data indicating a significant decrease in proficiency levels between 2018 and 2019 as well as this subgroup having the greatest gap between school and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	SWD proficiency levels will increase by 3% in the areas of ELA achievement, Math achievement, Social Studies and College and Career Acceleration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data tracking and data-driven instruction Increasing acceleration opportunities for students in this subgroup
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Common Assessments, Data Tracking & Collaborative planning are all a part of the highly effective PLC model (Dufour 2004)

Action Steps to Implement

Analysis of progress monitoring data (Performance Matters, STAR, common assessments)

Person Responsible	Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

Collaboration with ESE push-in support teachers and general ed teachers

Person Responsible	Ryan Vann (ryan.vann@polk-fl.net)

Strategic scheduling of ESE students with a variety of academies, programs and certification opportunities

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELL proficiency levels. ELL tested far below proficiency levels during the 1819 testing cycle
Measurable Outcome:	During the previous testing cycle our ELL students were 43% proficient. We believe we can increase ELL proficiency levels to 46%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based grading will be used in all classes. Increase language acquisition in our sheltered class. Increase dictionary availability in all core subject areas. Using LSI strategies effectively and providing opportunities for mastery will be promoted and measured during assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Dictionary use will increase language acquisition. Standards based grading will increase communication on standard mastery LSI solutions promotes mastery

Action Steps to Implement	
Continuous professional development - LSI	
Person Responsible	Sarah Whitaker (sarah.whitaker@polk-fl.net)
Standards Based Instruction - Training and data analysis will be continuous throughout the school year	
Person Responsible	Matthew Diaz (matthew.diaz@polk-fl.net)
Insure Dictionary availability - In order to increase language proficiency Increase use of programs such as Rosetta Stone and Reading works	
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Deshazor (elizabeth.deshazor@polk-fl.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increased student attendance rates will give the students with more chances to be engaged with the content. It has been shown, the more students are engaged with content, results in higher comprehension of the material. Attendance data shows that 8% of the student population missed 90% or more of their classes.
Measurable Outcome:	We plan to see a decrease from 3-5% of students who are missing 90% or more of their classes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Ulch (david.ulch@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior interventions such as "Brave Bucks" and "Positive Referrals" incentive programs will be implemented to improve our overall attendance goals.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These positive behavior interventions encourage students to exhibit our school goal oriented behaviors. Community organizations donated gift cards and coupons as incentives for our students who display positive school behavior. Teachers used both programs to promote positive school behavior through sending positive referrals or by rewarding students with Brave Buck currency to be redeemed through our PBIS store and recognition on social media outlets. Through these programs students strived to demonstrate positive behavior throughout campus and contributed to ongoing positive learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

Mr. Ulch and Mr. Jorge will continue to track student attendance and other early warning signs.

Person Responsible	David Ulch (david.ulch@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The School administration will follow the attendance action plan created at the beginning of the school year. Which outlines our step by step process on how to curb attendance issues.

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.

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) methods were implemented through school programs such as our Positive Referral and Brave Bucks incentive programs. Community organizations donated gift cards and coupons as incentives for our students who display positive school behavior. Teachers used both programs to promote positive school behavior through sending positive referrals or by rewarding students with Brave Buck currency to be redeemed through our PBIS store and recognition on social media outlets. Through these programs students strived to demonstrate positive behavior throughout campus and contributed to ongoing positive learning environment.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00