Polk County Public Schools

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

610 CHARLESTON AVE S, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://www.lawallstarlions.com/

Demographics

Principal: Alexander Mcluckey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/24/2017

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
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)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary School

610 CHARLESTON AVE S, Fort Meade, FL 33841

http://www.lawallstarlions.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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.

One Focus... Success for All

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lewis Anna Woodbury Elementary equips students with the academic skills and character traits necessary to perform at or above grade level and be prepared for success in college, career, and as productive citizens.

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
Wise, Alex	Principal	
Thomas, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Wilkin, Beth	Assistant Principal	
Hatton, Stella	Reading Coach	
Gargus, Amy	Teacher, ESE	
DeVane, Brooke	Teacher, K-12	
Roberts, Adam	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/24/2017, Alexander Mcluckey

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.*
2

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school
626

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	90	108	115	109	106	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	626
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	27	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 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	0	0	0	0	42	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	24	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 6/24/2021

2020-21 - 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	122	103	103	114	100	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	18	15	10	8	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	7	7	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - 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	122	103	103	114	100	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	18	15	10	8	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	15	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	7	7	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	51%	57%	38%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	51%	58%	39%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	49%	53%	37%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	57%	63%	42%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	56%	62%	45%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	47%	51%	39%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				38%	47%	53%	42%	53%	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	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	47%	-6%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	62%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	34%	45%	-11%	53%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Early Lit, STAR Reading, STAR Math, Science Quarterlies

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	66	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	63	49
	Students With Disabilities	25	21	21
	English Language Learners	25	50	34
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	59	68	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	63	48
	Students With Disabilities	33	36	29
	English Language Learners	46	61	45

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82	82	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	81	83	46
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners	70	81	41
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49	46	39
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	47	38
	Students With Disabilities	9	8	9
	English Language Learners	36	38	23

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	53	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	51	45
	Students With Disabilities	17	5	10
	English Language Learners	35	44	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	52	56	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	52	52	39
	Students With Disabilities	11	10	5
	English Language Learners	48	47	32

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	38	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	40	28
	Students With Disabilities		6	
	English Language Learners	19	25	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40	44	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	44	32
	Students With Disabilities	21	6	
	English Language Learners	23	32	22

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	46	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	47	46
	Students With Disabilities	18		9
	English Language Learners	25	33	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30	34	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	28	32	41
	Students With Disabilities	18	9	18
	English Language Learners	28	31	44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	52	40	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	38	57
	Students With Disabilities	27		
	English Language Learners	62	43	48

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	40		18	33		8				
ELL	29	25	42	30	28	9	25				
BLK	19	20		26	20						
HSP	35	31	41	32	28	17	31				
WHT	49	43		41	29		50				
FRL	37	34	50	30	23	5	31				

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	15	30	43	34	61	56	18				
ELL	32	39	56	56	73	76	30				
BLK	43	55	64	44	47	31	26				
HSP	43	45	50	55	69	65	33				
WHT	49	49	60	53	50	56	47				
FRL	41	46	57	49	59	59	29				

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	8	20	29	9	28	20	18				
ELL	24	53	52	26	49	47	23				
BLK	23	21		35	38	46	7				
HSP	37	49	48	38	52	46	40				
WHT	45	32	21	50	41	20	56				
FRL	35	39	38	38	43	38	38				

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	268
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?	N/A
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	21
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	42
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	32
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?

The trends that have emerged across grades 3 through 5 are low proficiency scores in ELA. Another trend is that our ESE subgroup is not performing at the same level as other subgroups and for our school as a whole.

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

The greatest need for improvement lies among learning gains for our lowest quartile students in both ELA and Math.

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

The contributing factor for this need is that more support is needed for students individually. The support is needed at their current level. With additional funding, we hope to support lowest quartile students by hiring additional paras as well as purchasing materials to assist students in making appropriate gains.

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

Math proficiency increased in 2019, however, we struggled to maintain a percentage that indicated proficiency on STAR Math (progress monitoring) in 2020-21.

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

Teacher knowledge of content and understanding the full intent of the standard is the first contributing factor. We intentionally focused on small-group instruction during the math block and this also contributed to our improvement.

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

Intentional differentiation to meet the needs of all students will allow acceleration to occur.

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.

We will provide extended planning days and professional development conducted by instructional coaches throughout the year.

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

Continued implementation of previous practices with fidelity as well as an additional focus on intentional differentiation will sustain our improvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on FSA data and progress monitoring, there was a need for improvement for ELA. In order to increase proficiency and learning gains in ELA, students must be engaged during instructional time and an increase amount of time in text.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency and learning gains to have a sum of 100.
Monitoring:	Walk through data from leadership .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Julie Thomas (julie.thomas@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based strategies including instructional support, intervention, and enrichment through small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are engaged in their learning, then proficiency and learning gains will increase.
Action Steps to Implement	
Continue development toward full intent and depth of standards for both LAFS and BEST.	
Person Responsible	Julie Thomas (julie.thomas@polk-fl.net)
Supporting instructional best practices.	
Person Responsible	Julie Thomas (julie.thomas@polk-fl.net)
Continuous parental involvement and positivity in school culture.	
Person Responsible	Stella Hatton (stella.hatton@polk-fl.net)
Data charts, planning, and consistent review	
Person Responsible	Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to increase proficiency and learning gains in math, students must be engaged during instruction as well as build solid foundations through fact fluency.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase math proficiency and learning gains to a combined sum of 125.
Monitoring:	Walk through data from leadership .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Beth Wilkin (beth.wilkin@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research-based strategies, including instructional support, intervention, and enrichment through small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are engaged in their learning, then proficiency and learning gains will increase.

Action Steps to Implement	
Continue development toward full intent and depth of standards for both LAFS and BEST.	
Person Responsible	Beth Wilkin (beth.wilkin@polk-fl.net)
Continuous parental involvement and positivity in school culture.	
Person Responsible	Adam Roberts (adam.roberts@polk-fl.net)
Data charts, planning, and consistent review	
Person Responsible	Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school has been identified as needing additional support. The criteria which qualified our school was students in grades Kindergarten through five, where 50 percent or more of its students, in any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment
Measurable Outcome:	Use progress monitoring (STAR, Step Testing) to demonstrate that students are making appropriate growth (grade equivalent/step progression) Increase ELA proficiency and learning gains to have a sum of 100.
Monitoring:	Walk through data from leadership .
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research based strategies including Fountas & Pinnell LLI program, Florida Wonders, instructional support, intervention, and enrichment through small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students experience success in reading they will continue their efforts to grow; then proficiency and learning gains will increase.

Action Steps to Implement	
Ensure all staff is properly trained and on the same page on development and presentation of lessons for school-wide programs.	
Person Responsible	Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)
Communicate expected teaching practices. Support instructional best practices.	
Person Responsible	Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)
Continuous parental involvement and positivity in school culture.	
Person Responsible	Stella Hatton (stella.hatton@polk-fl.net)
Data charts, planning, and consistent review	
Person Responsible	Alex Wise (alex.wise@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, 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.

An area of concern is the area of intimidation or verbal threats. We are 957 out of 1395 for the schools across the state of Florida. School environment will be modified through the use of verbal de-escalation strategies as well as cool down areas. Teachers will be trained through FDLRS and district department with the Mental Health Facilitator.

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.

At the beginning of each school year, Mosaic provides our staff with a back-to-school team-building activity. Though the leadership team develops the activity, Mosaic helps us find locations for these events and supplies us with the funds to conduct these team-building activities. The school hosts a team-building activity for all staff on the first day back from vacation. This allows from staff from all areas to build relationships.

PTO provides both staff and students with incentives and morale-boosting activities throughout the year.

SAC provides funds to purchase incentives to reward various student academic achievements.

PBIS rewards students for positive behavior choices every month to six weeks.

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

Mosaic - funds (see above)
PTO - funds and picking up/distributing supplies (see above)
SAC - funds (see above)
PBIS - funds (see above)

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00