

St. Johns County School District

# Ketterlinus Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Ketterlinus Elementary School

67 ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-kes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Kathy Tucker**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Ketterlinus Elementary School

67 ORANGE ST, St Augustine, FL 32084

<http://www-kes.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>41%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>22%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

## 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.

KES will accomplish the highest academic achievement possible for each of our students within a safe learning environment that is staffed by caring, highly qualified teachers and staff.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that “all children can learn and succeed” but not on the same day in the same way.  
 We believe that increased student achievement, along with school safety, should be our top priorities.  
 We support the six pillars of character as outlined in the Character Counts! Program.  
 We strive to build a true professional learning community.  
 We understand the critical connection between home and school.  
 While supporting high standards and the need for a core academic curriculum, we also believe in the theory there are multiple intelligences in human beings.

### 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
Brush, Sue	Teacher, K-12	Instructional Literacy Coach, RTI Coordinatnd Professional Development Coordinator
McCutcheon, Sandy	School Counselor	
Tucker, Kathy	Principal	
Hilbert, Bethany	Teacher, K-12	
Killin, Larissa	Teacher, K-12	
Simmons, Shana	Teacher, ESE	
Stoll, Kora	SAC Member	
Allen, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Sclafani, Lisa	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/31/2020, Kathy Tucker

**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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

31

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	47%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	53	64	91	59	53	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	10	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	1	9	8	4	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	2	5	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	4	5	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	4	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**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	53	64	91	59	53	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	10	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	1	9	8	4	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	2	5	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

**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	4	5	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	4	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

**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	73%	75%	57%	73%	74%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	67%	58%	54%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	59%	53%	28%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	77%	63%	73%	75%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	69%	62%	55%	69%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	59%	51%	35%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	72%	53%	55%	69%	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	68%	78%	-10%	58%	10%
	2018	65%	78%	-13%	57%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	77%	-1%	58%	18%
	2018	67%	74%	-7%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	69%	76%	-7%	56%	13%
	2018	71%	73%	-2%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	82%	-8%	62%	12%
	2018	68%	80%	-12%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	82%	-4%	64%	14%
	2018	74%	83%	-9%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	72%	80%	-8%	60%	12%
	2018	76%	79%	-3%	61%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	73%	-13%	53%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	73%	73%	0%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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	31	50	57	45	47	35	44				
BLK	56	70		53	64						
WHT	75	70	70	79	68	54	66				
FRL	63	66	65	69	65	41	50				
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	25	36	32	43	51	35	27				
BLK	40	55		42	40						
HSP	75			83							
WHT	71	63	47	75	70	48	75				
FRL	55	54	34	63	61	37	61				
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	41	32	22	44	31	24	21				
BLK	26	36		33	38						
HSP	73			82							
WHT	78	57	38	76	54	33	58				
FRL	61	47	28	59	47	29	34				

### 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	466
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	69
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	60
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.**

Students with disabilities in both reading and math continue to be a concern. Factors include 4th quarter distance learning and lack of family engagement.

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

Students with disabilities showed no decline but no growth in math. Factors to this include 4th quarter distance learning and parent engagement/involvement with student's academic achievement.

**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 showed the greatest gap. Factors to this include 4th quarter distance learning and parent engagement/involvement with student's academic achievement.

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

Lowest quartile in reading showed the greatest growth. Factors include school-wide reading initiative and individualized reading goals and small group instruction.

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

Attendance continues to be a concern.

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

1. Language Arts (ELA)
2. Math
3. Culture/Environment
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Raise the lowest quartile of students in ELA by providing explicit targeted phonemic, phonics and vocabulary lessons through our pilot project with UFLI. Also, continue our school-wide reading initiative that utilizes Accelerated Reader to measure individual students' independent reading practice.

**Measurable Outcome:** Going from 67% with our lowest quartile to 69% on state standardized test scores.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Explicit multi-sensory instruction in reading (phonemic awareness, phonics and vocabulary)  
Independent Reading

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students are struggling with language and reading comprehension which directly correlates with their ability to read.

**Action Steps to Implement**

ESE, Primary EBD, and all K-2 teachers training in UFLI.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Provide reading manipulative to all K-2 students.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Monitor teacher strategies through iObservation and provide specific feedback.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)



## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Through our school's PLC process in grades 3-5, teachers will work collaboratively to address students who are in need of remediation or enrichment in math.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase the lowest quartile in math from 48% to 60% as indicated on state standardized testing.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Professional Learning Communities - PLC process in which teachers work together and share data and plan to implement a grade-level wide intervention in math in grades 3-5.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our lowest quartile students are showing some improvement in math, but minimal. Through the PLC process and grade-level wide common intervention block.

### Action Steps to Implement

Teachers in grades 3-5, will work collaboratively to review data to assign intervention and enrichment lessons to students on their grade-level. PLC will begin in 2nd quarter due to pandemic.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** After the pandemic, SEL is more important as we have seen many of students take a back slide in their emotional well-being.

**Measurable Outcome:** 100% of our instructional staff will be trained in Conscious Discipline and implement (5) strategies school-wide.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Conscious Discipline is a Social Emotional Curriculum that has been CASEl select curriculum. It focuses on improving students' functional skills by providing training to educators on their skills, perception and strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** After the pandemic, there is a greater need to improve students' social emotional well being in order to learn.

### Action Steps to Implement

100% will receive Conscious Discipline training via on-line courses.

**Person Responsible** Kathy Tucker (kathy.tucker@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Language Arts/ELA - continue school-wide initiative in reading. In addition, K-2 & ESE teachers are involved in a pilot project with University of Florida's UFLI program.**

## 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.

Ketterlinus implements the PBIS - Positive Behavior Intervention System schoolwide in all areas of the school. The school uses the acronym of SWIM to focus on Safety, Well-Mannered, Improving & Inspiring and Making Good Choices to develop classroom rules and common areas rules.

In addition, the school has begun the implementation of Conscious Discipline within all classes. The school has identified 6 strategies that will be implemented this year to develop a nurturing, safe culture to learn.

The seven strategies include:

- 1) Friends & Family board in the classroom
- 2) Job Board – every student has a job that cannot be taken away as punishment.
- 3) Greeting at the door
- 4) Activity to unite –
- 5) Safe Place in the classroom
- 6) Wish Well Ritual

### **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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>