Hillsborough County Public Schools

The Collaboratory Preparatory Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
•	
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

The Collaboratory Preparatory Academy

6406 E CHELSEA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: F (24%) 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Inf	formation*
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F	or more information, click here.

School Board Approval

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

Last Modified: 5/6/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 3 of 19

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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Last Modified: 5/6/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 19

The Collaboratory Preparatory Academy

6406 E CHELSEA ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and G (per MSID		2020-21 Title I School	Disadvar	1 Economically ntaged (FRL) Rate rted on Survey 3)
Elementary S KG-5	School	Yes		100%
Primary Servi (per MSID	• •	Charter School	(Report	9 Minority Rate ted as Non-white in Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	Yes		92%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		С	С	F

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.

Our mission is to prepare learners of Hillsborough, K through 5th grade, for high school, college, and for the work force by delivering a world class education through the arts in a collaborative environment fueled by a passion for learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create an educational family which develops character driven, culturally literate, life-long learners who bring value to their community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Scott, Carolyn	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Cassandra Smith

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

7

Total number of students enrolled at the school

100

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

2

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

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	17	17	13	15	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	6	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	evel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	4	3	2	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	evel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 9/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	20	16	14	20	18	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator						Gr	ade	Le	vel					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	20	16	14	20	18	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level								Total					
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level										Total		
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 Review

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

School Grade Component	2021				2019			2018		
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State	
ELA Achievement				22%	52%	57%	20%	52%	56%	
ELA Learning Gains				50%	55%	58%		52%	55%	
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					50%	53%		46%	48%	
Math Achievement				27%	54%	63%	27%	55%	62%	
Math Learning Gains				65%	57%	62%		57%	59%	
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					46%	51%		44%	47%	
Science Achievement					50%	53%		51%	55%	

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

			ELA			
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	16%	52%	-36%	58%	-42%
Cohort Co	mparison					
04	2021					
	2019	26%	55%	-29%	58%	-32%
Cohort Coi	mparison	-16%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Co	mparison	-26%			•	

	MATH									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison				
03	2021									
	2019	16%	54%	-38%	62%	-46%				
Cohort Cor	nparison									
04	2021									
	2019	42%	57%	-15%	64%	-22%				

	MATH									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison				
Cohort Com	nparison	-16%								
05	2021									
	2019									
Cohort Com	nparison	-42%								

	SCIENCE									
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison				
05	2021									
	2019									
Cohort Con	nparison									

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Istation

		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53%	53%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	53%	68%
, ate	Students With Disabilities	33%	66%	66%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63%	53%	47%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	53%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

		Grade 2		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46%	54%	85%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	46%	54%	85%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53%	47%	53%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	47%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners	0%	50%	50%
		Grade 3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Grade 3 Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 53%	Spring 58%
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities	Fall 32%	53%	58%
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	Fall 32% 32%	53% 53%	58% 58%
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language	Fall 32% 32% 20% 33% Fall	53% 53% 66% 33% Winter	58% 58% 66% 33% Spring
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students	Fall 32% 32% 20% 33%	53% 53% 66% 33%	58% 58% 66% 33%
	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 32% 32% 20% 33% Fall	53% 53% 66% 33% Winter	58% 58% 66% 33% Spring
Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically	Fall 32% 32% 20% 33% Fall 46%	53% 53% 66% 33% Winter 54%	58% 58% 66% 33% Spring 62%

		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	83%	67%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	56%	83%	67%
Aits	Students With Disabilities	0%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	46%	54%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	46%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	20%	50%
	English Language Learners	33%	33%	33%
		Grade 5		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53%	73%	87%
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	53%	73%	87%
,	Students With Disabilities	25%	25%	50%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32%	46%	54%
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	46%	54%
	Students With Disabilities	33%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24%	33%	44%
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	33%	44%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%

		Grade		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
		Grade		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

		Grade		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHO	DL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	30		15	30						
BLK	14	38		14	14		10				
HSP	57			57							
FRL	23	46		23	17		17				
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
BLK	18	42		18	50						
FRL	20	50		26	65						
		2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
BLK	20			10							
FRL	21			29							

ESSA Data Review

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

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

ESSA Federal Index				
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	30			
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES			
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3			
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency				
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	151			
Total Components for the Federal Index	5			
Percent Tested	100%			
Subgroup Data				
Students With Disabilities				
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23			
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES			
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%				
English Language Learners				
Federal Index - English Language Learners				
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%				
Native American Students				
Federal Index - Native American Students				
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%				
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%				
Black/African American Students				
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	18			
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Hispanic Students				
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57			
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO			

Hispanic Students				
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Multiracial Students				
Federal Index - Multiracial Students				
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Pacific Islander Students				
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students				
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?				
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%				
White Students				
Federal Index - White Students				
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A			
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%				
Economically Disadvantaged Students				
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25			
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES			
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%				

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our black students are struggling to meet achievement and growth scores in math and ELA.

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

ELA achievement

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

2020 and 2021 were very difficult years. Attendance was very low and those who learned online did not participate like they should. All together, they lost any where from 1/2 to a full year of instruction. There is no online learning this year so all students will have to come in person. That will be a huge improvement. We also beefed up our ELA curriculum by adding new reading, writing and vocabulary supports.

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

Math gains.

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

We added additional minutes of math instruction to the schedule and added additional curriculum supports.

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

Additional minutes in reading and math instruction, before and after school tutoring, all tier 3 students have a reading endorsed instructor, cross-curricular lessons with science and social studies to support non-fiction reading skills.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

All classroom teachers will receive ongoing professional development in our new reading curriculum supports throughout the 21-22 year.

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

The new reading and math supports, the extra minutes of instruction, and the before and after school tutoring are all folded into our budget now, and will continue on as part of normal operating expenses.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In 19-20, we had 9 suspensions. Of those 9 suspensions, 4 were for the same student who had severe behavior issues and no longer attends our school. The other 5 suspensions were from the same, single, incident which involved cyber-bullying and did not take place on campus. In 20-21, we only had 4 suspensions and none of them were for violence of any kind. We have implemented the PATHs and PBIS systems and they working very well to help establish a culture of mutual respect and self-control.

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.

We will have daily communication through homework folders, weekly communication through class newsletters, monthly communication of formal assessment results, quarterly report cards and standardized testing results, communication of successes, current events and upcoming events through our school Facebook page, our website, notes home in homework folders, emails home, and message board at school. We will have parent volunteers in class, twice a year parent-teacher conferences, a back-to-school bash and an end-of-year celebration. We will have showcase performances twice a year as well as family events during the fall and winter holidays.

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

Principal- Creates culture of success paradigm

Staff- implements SEL daily

Parents- Participate and volunteer for class and school activities

Student Council- the student arm for organizing and promoting a culture of success

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Select below:	\$0.00
		Total:	\$0.00