Bryant Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
students
college and career
mission
school improvement
striving
achievement
ambitious
family and community involvement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
resources
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bryant Elementary School

13910 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Elise Suarez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Bryant Elementary School

13910 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

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	No	10%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To provide the highest quality education for all students in cooperation with parents, business partners, and our community while preparing them for a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bryant Broncos will be respectful, responsible, and caring while galloping to greatness.

School Leadership Team

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

Part I: School Information

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Oberschall, Ellen	Principal	The leadership team includes, for example: • Principal • Assistant Principal • Guidance Counselor • School Psychologist • School Social Worker • Academic Coaches (Reading, Math, etc. and other specialists on an ad hoc basis) • ESE teacher • PLC Liaisons for each grade level, K-5 • SAC Chair • ELP Coordinator • ELL Representative • Attendance Committee Representative • Behavior team Representative/Behavior Specialist/Coach (Note that not all members attend every meeting, but are invited based on the goals and purpose of the meeting) PSLT Coordinator—Principal/Assistant Principal: Coordinate and oversee the decision making process to ensure integrity and consistency of the PS/RtI implementation at the building level. The principal should attend PSLT meetings at the Tier 1 level, provide specific procedures for resource allocation, and monitor the fidelity of instruction/intervention at the school-wide and classroom levels (Tier 1) PSLT Meeting Facilitator— e.g., School Psychologist, Reading Coach, School Social Worker, Guidance Counselor, ESE Specialist, and/or Intervention Specialist: The facilitator opens the meeting with a brief description of what the team expects to accomplish during the meeting. The facilitator is to establish and maintain a supportive atmosphere throughout the meeting by encouraging participation from team members, clarifying and summarizing information communicated during the meeting, design specific procedures for ongoing communication between school staff and PSLT, and assist with monitoring the fidelity of intervention implementation across each tier. PSLT Content Specialist— e.g., Administrator, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Writing Coach, ESE Specialist, and/or Behavior Specialist: Ensures that when new content curricular materials are obtained, implementers are adequately trained to use the materials, check fidelity of use of curricular materials and strategies, determine what elements need to be included in an effective core instructional program and assist the team in identifying which instructional strategies are most effective to address areas of concerns. The Content Specialist may also assist with monitoring the fidelity of instruction and intervention implementation across each tier. PSLT Data Consultant— e.g., Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Science Coach, Academic Intervention Specialist, Behavior Specialist, Technology Support Personnel, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, ESE Specialist, and/ or Guidance Counselor: Prior to the meeting, the Data Consultant assists team members with collecting, organizing, analyzing, graphing and interpreting data. The data should be presented in easily understandable visual displays to guide the decision making process. PSLT Timekeeper—Ensures that meeting times are respected and helps the team stay focused on the respective agenda. Because many decisions need to

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities

be made during the meeting, the timekeeper should redirect the team's discussion when necessary. The timekeeper should know who are working on specific projects and set timelines for completion/implementation as well as monitor the fidelity across each tier.

PSLT Recorder—Records the plans of the team, including meeting minutes/notes. This person will capture all important information, especially related to instruction/ intervention specifics, progress monitoring, data analysis, and future meeting dates. The recorder may need to ask for clarification several times during the meeting to ensure that enough detail is recorded so that a person who did not attend the meeting would be able to clearly understand the nature and implementation of the instructional/intervention plan

The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/24/2020, Elise Suarez

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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	No

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
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: A (74%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (76%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	103	145	148	145	161	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	114	154	145	158	170	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	911
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	114	154	145	158	170	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	911
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	82%	52%	57%	86%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	55%	58%	77%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	50%	53%	70%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	86%	54%	63%	87%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	57%	62%	72%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	46%	51%	63%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	50%	53%	78%	48%	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	82%	52%	30%	58%	24%
	2018	82%	53%	29%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	55%	27%	58%	24%
	2018	85%	55%	30%	56%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
	2018	86%	51%	35%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	54%	28%	62%	20%
	2018	89%	55%	34%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	57%	33%	64%	26%
	2018	85%	57%	28%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	83%	54%	29%	60%	23%
	2018	85%	54%	31%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	80%	51%	29%	53%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	81%	52%	29%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	41	35	21	52	64	43	25				
ELL	60	58		74	79	70					
ASN	89	67		98	97		87				
BLK	71	64		71	91						
HSP	75	75		75	73	64	77				
MUL	90	89		88	79		69				
WHT	82	64	51	86	79	70	82				
FRL	69	63	41	77	77	63	77				

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	44	50	53	45	60	61	42				
ELL	70	79		65	57						
ASN	95	87		96	72		93				
BLK	86			79							
HSP	73	65	56	77	59	67	54				
MUL	92	57		94	70		100				
WHT	85	70	64	86	72	68	83				
FRL	67	60	43	62	56	50	60				

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	54	64	56	46	45	40	67				
ELL	67			74							
ASN	94	83		97	83		82				
HSP	63	63	63	79	59	42	64				
MUL	84	80		88	85		80				
WHT	88	77	71	86	71	63	78				
FRL	68	79		67	54	42	67				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
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	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	604
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	71
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	88
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	74
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73

Hispanic Students	
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	83
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	73
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	67
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Learning Gains of the Low 25% was -13 from the previous year

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

ELA Learning Gains overall (including ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%)

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 ELA Lowest 25th Percentile was -2% from the state average. Our Science Achievement was +28% above the state average.

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

Mathematics Learning Gains was +11 from the previous year. Our teachers are differentiating lessons based on our student's needs.

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

6 students with attendance below 90%
25 students at Level 1 on Statewide assessment

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

1. ELA Learning Gains of the Low 25%
2. ELA Learning Gains of SWD (ESE) students
3. ELA Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ongoing assessment for learning will provide data to teachers to inform instruction and make adjustments to meet the needs of students
Measurable Outcome:	1. Formative assessments to track student learning gains will be monitored using grade level PLC minutes. 2. Classroom walkthroughs and observations by Administration will provide data and feedback to progress monitor effectiveness of assessments and differentiated instruction. 3. Feedback will be provided to grade level teams and teachers. 4. Ongoing data collection will be analyzed weekly to determine if adjustments are needed to be made
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	By tracking and using ongoing assessment during learning, teachers can differentiate instruction to students and maximize learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher plans note tools for assessment and student self-reflection. Systems used to monitor student performance are visible to provide clarity of instructional goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Consistent collaboration among the general education teacher and the SWD teacher while utilizing the collaborative teaching model.

Person Responsible   Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)

Utilize the MTSS form as a tool to communicate about SWD and progress monitor the effectiveness of the interventions.

Person Responsible   Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)

Monitor IEP goals through quarterly meetings with SWD teachers and general education teachers. Documentation of progress towards individual goals will be discussed, and data will be used to drive discussions.

Person Responsible   Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Formative assessments to track student learning gains will be monitored using grade level PLC minutes.
2. Classroom walkthroughs and observations by Administration will provide data and feedback to progress monitor effectiveness of assessments and differentiated instruction.
3. Feedback will be provided to grade level teams and teachers.
4. Ongoing data collection will be analyzed weekly to determine if adjustments are needed to be made

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.

Character building lessons, Morning Meetings, and the development of relationships among younger and older students through the Buddy Reader classes will enhance learning.

1. Teachers will participate in a book study: Leader in Me
2. Ongoing Grade level PLC Collaborative Planning to create Morning Meeting lessons/ Social Studies lessons
3. Teachers will display leadership boards or other visuals to promote this goal.
4. Students will build an understanding and demonstrating leadership habits/

.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00