

Charlotte County Public Schools

# Charlotte Harbor School



## 2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>R.A.I.S.E</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>

## Charlotte Harbor School

22450 HANCOCK AVE, Port Charlotte, FL 33980

<http://yourcharlotteschools.net/chc>

### Demographics

**Principal: Herb Bennett**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2021

<b>2021-22 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Function</b> (per accountability file)	ESE
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Special Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: Maintaining 2018-19: Commendable 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Unsatisfactory
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating</b>	2023-24: No Rating

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

We strive to educate students and to assist them in realizing their full potential as responsible, productive, contributing members of society by providing an educational environment in which students are challenged, excellence is expected, and differences are valued.

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

Reaching our potential.

#### Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Every student at Charlotte Harbor Center is an ESE student and has an IEP. To meet the needs of our students and their variety of special needs, we have additional staff to provide students with extra support and attention in the classroom. Several other professionals are employed to provide students with support such as: two behavior specialists, a social worker, school psychologist, a contracted therapist from Charlotte Behavioral Center, two physical therapist, a speech therapist, an occupational therapist, and contracted vision and hearing therapists.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bennett, Herb	Principal	As principal of the school, Mr. Bennett oversees the daily operations and functions of the school environment. He also organizes the staff for optimum success based on staff members strengths and weaknesses.
Arritt, Jon	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principal, Jon Arritt offers support and counsel on overseeing the school environment and the task assignments of various staff members. He also works with teachers to develop a research based and standards based curriculum.
Wood, Sandra	Behavior Specialist	As the behavior specialist, Sandra Wood collects and analyzes behavior data to both determine the effectiveness of behavior strategies and develop new strategies as needed. She also performs functional behavior assessments and writes behavior intervention plans.

#### Is education provided through contract for educational services?

Yes

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

Charlotte County School District.

**Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Thursday 8/12/2021, Herb Bennett

**Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?**

22

**Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?**

1

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

23

**Total number of students enrolled at the school.**

160

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

4

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

4

**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	5	8	7	16	10	8	14	14	19	14	13	8	21	157	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	9	1	5	2	5	30	
One or more suspensions	0	6	0	5	6	2	5	3	7	0	1	2	0	37	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	0	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	0	11	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	1	1	10	6	3	4	4	2	6	39	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	1	2	9	8	6	4	5	3	3	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	7	3	9	3	5	3	6	6	7	4	1	14	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	4	7	3	10	9	4	4	5	8	9	5	5	14	87

**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	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	5	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 7/16/2021

**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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	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	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		
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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					65%	61%		73%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					49%	59%		53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					46%	54%			52%
Math Achievement					60%	62%		54%	61%
Math Learning Gains					43%	59%		45%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					35%	52%			52%
Science Achievement					60%	56%		83%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					75%	78%		65%	77%

**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	0%	69%	-69%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	46%	-46%	52%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
10	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	0%	70%	-70%	62%	-62%



MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019	0%	56%	-56%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019	80%	47%	33%	46%	34%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	0%	55%	-55%	48%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	78%	-78%	71%	-71%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	76%	-76%	70%	-70%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

### 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	49	69		52	71		45	20			
HSP	20										
WHT	56	67		59	71		57				
FRL	48	74		53	75		43				
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	35	58		39	49		17	29		45	
BLK	50			42	40						
WHT	33	53		44	56		20	40			
FRL	36	68		44	58		17				
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

### 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	51
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	306
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	80%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	20
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 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	62
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	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

#### Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

The goals from last years School Improvement Plan include: increasing the graduation rate, updating or creating the behavior plans for students that are outdated by 5 years or more, and increasing biology test scores by 40%. The only low performing ESSA subgroup was students with disabilities, which accounts for the entire student body. Progress monitoring was hindered by a lack of access to county mandated programs such as USATestprep.

#### Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The graduation rate increased from 42.9% in the 2017-2018 school year, to 83.3% in the 2019-2020 school year. This was done by regularly checking in with the graduating students and their teachers to see what their status was in class and providing support when it was appropriate.

#### What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Based on the 2019-2020 assessment data, the 6th grade English students, whom will be seventh graders this coming school year, have the most room for improvement as 10 out of 14 students received a Level 1 on their ELA assessments, which was the highest rate of Level 1 ELA test results among any of the grade levels.

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

The only subgroup that fell below the federal index level was students with disabilities, which makes up the entire campus population. 6th and 7th grade had the highest rate of failure for assessments in ELA and Math, suggesting that students that fail one usually fail the other as well.

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

Some of the strategies that need to be implemented include: a review of accommodations in students Individualized Education Plans to determine if new accommodations are necessary and appropriate, active adherence to the IEP for each student, regular progress monitoring, and frequent review of student performance to determine if the method of instruction is leading to academic growth.

**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.**

The school liaison is having a meeting at the start of the year to discuss the importance of compliance with Individualized Education Plans, and adherence to accommodations in the Individualized Education Plans.

**Part III: Planning for Improvement****Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

10 out of 14 sixth grade students received a Level 1 on their ELA assessment last year. This is the highest rate of level 1 students for either Math or ELA for any grade.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

20% of 7th grade students whom received a Level 1 on the previous school years ELA assessment will receive a Level 2 or higher on this years ELA assessment.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Beginning of year, middle of year, and end of year assessments to assess student academic growth. Teachers and students will also regularly review their work in class to further assess whether or not the student is making academic gains in the classroom.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jon Arritt (jon.arritt@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Progress monitoring will be done through bi-weekly reviews of student progress.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Progress monitoring is a evidenced based strategy as it involves the frequent review of student performance to determine whether or not students are making the necessary gains. If students are not making gains, then the method of instruction and accommodations for that student can be reviewed to determine what course of action needs to be taken to promote student success.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus*****Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

1. Progress reports are updated every 9 weeks and are reviewed by administration and school liaison.
2. Academic student shortfalls based on data will be reviewed in MTSS meetings for SANDS students, and SAT meetings for West Campus students.
3. IEP accommodations will be implemented by teachers and monitored by the school liaison quarterly.
4. Teachers will meet with students bi-weekly to review progress monitoring results.
5. Teachers and student will analyze last years scores to determine what specific ELA skills they need to improve upon.
6. Teachers will check in with students to help track progress toward meeting their goal.

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Students with disabilities were identified as the only subgroup that was deemed to be in need of additional support at Charlotte Harbor Center.

**Measurable Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

All students with Individualized Education Plans will have their testing accommodations reviewed and updated to meet the current needs of those special needs students that received Level 1 on either ELA or Math Assessments.

**Monitoring:**

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The school liaison schedules all IEP meetings and oversees the updates of those IEPs. Thus it can be tracked and documented what students had their IEP meetings and whether or not accommodations were reviewed.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Herb Bennett (herb.bennett@yourcharlotteschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Implementing appropriate accommodations to give ESE students the support they need on assessments.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Every student at Charlotte Harbor Center is an ESE student with an IEP, which means every student that received a Level 1 on either the ELA or Math assessment is an ESE student with an IEP. Since students at such a level are most likely struggling academically, it stands to reason that the IEP accommodations must be modified to provide struggling students with the support they need.

**Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

**Monitoring ESSA Impact:**

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

1. Teachers will identify which of their ESE students received a Level 1 on either Math or ELA assessments last year.
2. The identified student's current teachers will collaborate with previous teachers of the student to determine what accommodations have been used in the past and how successful those accommodations were.
3. Teachers will review prior IEPs to see what accommodations were in place, if they were being implemented appropriately, and if they were successful. This will help determine if a previous accommodation needs to be reimplemented, and what accommodations have been tried.
4. At IEP meetings, the accommodations will be reviewed by the IEP team to determine their efficacy and if new accommodations need to be put in place.
5. Current IEP accommodations will be implemented regularly in the classroom to determine their efficacy and support for student growth.

## 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.

The Positive Behavior Intervention and Support team was re-established last year and is performing a variety of functions to promote a positive environment on the Charlotte Harbor campus. Some of these functions include:

1. Fundraisers to keep the school store stocked with incentives to reward positive behavior growth.
2. Providing classrooms and high traffic areas with posters to help teach the rules and routines of the classroom or area.
3. Providing staff members with copies of the PBIS and MTSS procedures so that rules, routines, and positive behaviors are promoted and reinforced consistently throughout the campus.
4. A welcome committee which produces welcome packets to help orient new students and families to the rules, routines, and culture of the Charlotte Harbor Campus.
5. Staff Shout Outs to show appreciation for the hard work done by staff to promote positive behavior.
6. Providing teachers with a template for Behavior Contracts that they can use to motivate student behavior in the classroom.

Other initiatives separate from PBIS exist to promote a positive culture and learning environment on the Charlotte Harbor Campus include:

1. The use of a cool down room for students who are frustrated.
2. In class breaks and additional support staff.
3. Weekly MTSS and SAT meeting to discuss student achievement and behavior.

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

The following are the members of the PBIS Team and their roles in promoting a positive culture on Charlotte Harbor Campus:

Daniel Melvin - PBIS Facilitator/ Social Studies Teacher - Organizes meetings once a month of the PBIS Team to discuss implementation of behavior strategies. He also helps to support the execution of the PBIS Teams various functions.

Jon Arritt - Assistant Principal - Supports the implementation of PBIS strategies throughout the campus and develop the constitution of the PBIS Team. Oversees the discipline system.



Sandra Wood - Behavior specialist - Organizes, stocks, and oversees the function of the school store. Also tracks and records behavior data for the implementation of student IEPs.

TBA - Behavior specialist - Organizes, stocks, and oversees the function of the school store. Also tracks and records behavior data for the implementation of student IEPs.

Lori Arritt - Paraprofessional - Organizes and oversees cool down room.

Patricia Millspaugh - Paraprofessional - Oversees students completing think sheets as the first part of the five step discipline plan.

Tiffany Furlow - VE Teacher/ Program Planner - Provides insight into strategies to support West Campus students in the development of behavior strategies.

Deborah Hemphill - Paraprofessional - Organizes and volunteers at various fundraisers for the school store.

Adam Burke - Social Worker - Works with families to offer them support and keep them informed of positive behavior initiatives.

Myla Streander - School Psychologist - Provides counseling to various students and valuable insight into issues that may be motivating socially maladjusted behaviors.