

Escambia County School District

Scenic Heights Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Scenic Heights Elementary School

3801 CHERRY LAUREL DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Cox G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	86%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Scenic Heights Elementary School

3801 CHERRY LAUREL DR, Pensacola, FL 32504

www.escambiaschools.org

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 KG-5	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

At Scenic Heights, we strive to discover and develop the promise within each child. We, the staff of Scenic Heights Elementary School, consider the needs and interests of each child a priority.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that each child should acquire the fundamental skills necessary for participation in our democratic society. To insure success in our changing society, we challenge our students to pursue the ability to change and to cope with change.

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
Cox, Michelle	Principal	
Maloney, Katie	Assistant Principal	
Thompson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Palmer, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	
Brault, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	
Calder, Janette	Instructional Media	
Woodruff, Kaci	Teacher, K-12	
Cox, Megan	Teacher, ESE	
McDaniel, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Piatnik, Megan	Teacher, K-12	
Lipham, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Michelle Cox G

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

696

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.

5

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	78	129	124	120	131	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	680
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	15	28	17	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	11	8	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in Math	0	4	3	6	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	7	12	8	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	5	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	13	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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 7/26/2021

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	130	116	134	101	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	8	14	13	7	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	6	8	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	130	116	134	101	149	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	752
Attendance below 90 percent	8	14	13	7	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	5	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	6	8	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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				64%	53%	57%	63%	49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	55%	58%	58%	46%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	52%	53%	43%	40%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	57%	63%	67%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	60%	62%	69%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	52%	51%	64%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	54%	53%	75%	55%	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	73%	56%	17%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	58%	-1%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	55%	13%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	53%	9%
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 was utilized for fall, winter, and spring ELA & Math progress monitoring. The science district quarterly assessment was used for science progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school, during both survey 2 & 3.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53 / 44.9%	82 / 68.3%	88 / 71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25 / 43.1%	35 / 59.3%	38 / 59.4%
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 33.3%	13 / 81.3%	12 / 75%
	English Language Learners	3 / 21.4%	6 / 37.5%	3 / 20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65 / 54.6%	81 / 68.6%	86 / 71.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33 / 55.9%	37 / 62.7%	40 / 63.5%
	Students With Disabilities	8 / 53.3%	10 / 66.7%	11 / 68.8%
	English Language Learners	5 / 35.7%	4 / 26.7%	4 / 33.3%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56 / 54.9%	61 / 56%	73 / 63.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26 / 54.2%	28 / 52.8%	33 / 58.9%
	Students With Disabilities	5 / 62.5%	6 / 50%	5 / 41.7%
	English Language Learners	2 / 12.5%	3 / 21.4%	5 / 29.4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	43 / 39.8%	57 / 51.8%	67 / 58.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 34%	24 / 44.4%	31 / 55.4
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 33.3%	5 / 41.7%	5 / 41.7
	English Language Learners	3 / 18.8%	5 / 31.3%	3 / 17.6
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52 / 41.9	76 / 60.8	79 / 63.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 26.3	22 / 40.7	23 / 42.6
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7.1	5 / 29.4	6 / 35.3
	English Language Learners	2 / 10	6 / 40	4 / 25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	76 / 61.8	85 / 68.5	89 / 71.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	29 / 51.8	28 / 52.8	34 / 61.8
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 26.7	8 / 47.1	8 / 47.1
	English Language Learners	6 / 30	8 / 57.1	7 / 43.8

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39 / 44.8	45 / 50	47 / 54
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 41.9	19 / 46.3	19 / 48.7
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13.3	4 / 22.2	5 / 31.3
	English Language Learners	0 / 0	4 / 25	4 / 26.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36 / 41.1	47 / 53.4	44 / 51.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 39.5	20 / 51.3	17 / 44.7
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 20	7 / 38.9	3 / 18.8
	English Language Learners	4 / 23.5	4 / 26.7	7 / 46.7
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52 / 40.9	73 / 54.5	64 / 49.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	19 / 32.8	24 / 42.9	23 / 43.4
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 15.4	1 / 7.1	1 / 7.7
	English Language Learners	2 / 10	4 / 25	6 / 37.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53 / 40.5	66 / 49.3	71 / 54.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 33.5	23 / 40.4	26 / 49.1
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7.7	1 / 7.1	0 / 0
	English Language Learners	7 / 30.4	6 / 37.5	8 / 47.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	73 / 57.9	80 / 65	82 / 65.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	29 / 50.9	32 / 58.2	28 / 54.9
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0	5 / 38.5	4 / 30.8
	English Language Learners	9 / 47.4	6 / 37.5	8 / 47.1

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	37	20		27	20	18	29				
ELL	44	61	60	45	47		56				
ASN	88	82		85	73		83				
BLK	43	38	45	46	38		31				
HSP	45	45		50	53		67				
MUL	84			77			80				
WHT	73	49	30	75	42	23	72				
FRL	58	47	47	59	37	32	53				
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	37	45	60	40	60	61	25				
ELL	42	58	57	56	68	69	19				
ASN	69	64		84	83		67				
BLK	45	53	46	48	42	50	33				
HSP	48	53	57	65	69	70	47				
MUL	81	52		78	48		92				
WHT	73	59	57	75	68	45	71				
FRL	59	50	50	62	56	52	54				
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	32	44	60	32	60	71	58				
ELL	31	52	57	45	72	65					
ASN	61	50		74	84						
BLK	42	51	30	43	51	57	56				
HSP	55	46	40	62	73	53	73				
MUL	64	67		73	81						
WHT	72	64	52	74	72	74	81				
FRL	58	56	38	59	65	69	75				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
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	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	52
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	52
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.

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

The percentage increase between AP1 & AP2 did not remain consistent between AP2 & AP3. The percentage increase was much smaller between AP2 & AP3.

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

The greatest need for improvement is with learning gains for all K-5 students; especially those students within the lowest quartile.

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

One of the contributing factors is that our ELL students just finished taking WIDA (that's the ELL test that measures English proficiency) prior to taking the AP3 STAR assessment.

Another contributing factor is that FSA testing falls during Ramadan. Our Muslim students take FSA without having eaten since sunset the night before.

Here's another contributing factor, students are unmotivated when AP3 is given. An incentive can be given to hopefully motivate students to put more effort into AP3.

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

We started off strong; we had a decent percentage increase in proficiency, learning gains, & lowest quartile gains between AP1 and AP2.

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

Students and teachers are more motivated at the beginning of the year.

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

We need to continue the stamina all the way through the final assessment. This means we need to stay steadfast in analyzing data and using it to drive instruction.

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 are going to increase and intensify the number of data chats after AP2.

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

I don't have any additional services at this time.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	The data reviewed showed lower than acceptable scores and thus a critical need for improvement in learning gains for all students and learning gains for lowest quartile students in both ELA and Math.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 FSA scores will result in a minimum of 72% of students making learning gains in both ELA and Math. This includes students in the lowest quartile as well.
Monitoring:	Data meetings will be held after each STAR assessment period to analyze the growth of all students, including those in the lowest quartile.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists using programs such as Orton Gillingham and 95% group (phonics chip kits; multisyllabic word routines). We will also make available intensive and individualized interventions for students struggling in math using Bridges Intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive intervention with our lowest quartile students will improve learning gains. Interventions for students struggling in reading and math were selected using What Works Clearinghouse.

Action Steps to Implement

Select teachers are chosen each year to get trained in Orton Gillinham. Ongoing training for phonics chip kits, multisyllabic word routines, and Bridges Interventions occur throughout the school year.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

SCENIC HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students. This rate is less than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. This data falls into the very low category of school incident rankings.

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.

Generating clear, open communication with the parents of our students helps us avoid misunderstandings and remove feelings of mistrust. We celebrate personal achievement and good behavior by complementing students. This helps them to feel that they are cared for individually. We have also established school norms that build positive values. In addition, we have set consistent discipline and behavior expectations. We continuously model the behaviors that we want to see in our school. Rituals and traditions are created for our school that are fun for students, such as Chloe's Comedy, Did You Know, annual Red Ribbon and Literacy Week activities, April Fool's Day, and traditional last day of school countdown.

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

Employees, families, students, and the community are the stakeholders that work together to promote a positive culture and environment at Scenic Heights Elementary.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00