

District School Board of Madison County

Lee Elementary School



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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lee Elementary School

7731 US 90, Lee, FL 32059

<http://les.madison.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Christi Minor

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 PK-6
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Madison 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Lee Elementary School

7731 US 90, Lee, FL 32059

<http://les.madison.k12.fl.us/>

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-6	Yes	93%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Madison 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.

Inspired Learning! We believe if we inspire our students, all of them will learn. Inspiration comes through establishing a warm, creative environment where students feel not only physically safe and secure, but confident enough to aim for high expectations. All staff members participate in the cultivation of our positive atmosphere with encouraging words and constant support for our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We want students to leave Lee Elementary with the academic skills as well as the character traits that will make them successful in life.

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
Brown, Amanda	Principal	The Principal oversees the daily activities and operations within a school. Their main duties include disciplining or advising students, approving Teachers' curriculums and ensuring the school environment is safe for all students and staff
Gonzalez, Rebecca	Reading Coach	Curriculum coordinator, MTSS, ELL, Reading Coach
Douglas, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten ELA
Smith, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade ELA

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Christi Minor

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

12

Total number of students enrolled at the school

191

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

1

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

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	39	33	32	22	29	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	3	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	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	
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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	3	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	9	2	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/24/2021

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	37	30	39	31	35	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

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	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	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	37	30	39	31	35	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

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	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	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				60%	52%	57%	60%	64%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	50%	58%	58%	60%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	49%	53%	60%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				65%	57%	63%	74%	74%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	49%	62%	55%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	43%	51%	50%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	56%	53%	61%	48%	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	64%	40%	24%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	50%	6%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	46%	14%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	45%	30%	62%	13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	51%	28%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	44%	-10%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	42%	15%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady - ELA and Math
FSA - Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	44	92
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	36	72
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	33	50
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	25	67
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	57	67	88
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	42	88
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	55	61
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22	50	74
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	55	48
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33	36	74
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			53
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

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	40										
BLK	45			64							
WHT	75	64		80	50		64				
FRL	53	57		66	62		50				
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	57	50		57	60						
BLK	29	64		41	27						
HSP	55			64							
WHT	68	59	60	71	54		62				
FRL	54	53	50	58	40		47				
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	53			65							
HSP	57	60		86	60						
WHT	62	57	60	71	55	42	76				
FRL	51	55	55	72	58		63				

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	63
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	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40

Students With Disabilities	
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?	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	55
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	67
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	58
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?

During the 2018-2019 school year, 29% of African American/Black students scored at Proficiency on FSA/ELA Assessment while 64% made Learning Gains. During the 2018-2019 school year, 41% of African American/Black students scored at Proficiency on Mathematics Assessment while 27% made Learning Gains. From 2017-2018 school year to 2018-2019 school year, the percentage of students who made Learning Gains in both Mathematics and ELA increased by 1% for total students, including students in the Lower Quartile. The percentage of students scoring Proficiency on FSA/ELA assessment increased by 2.9% from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year.

The percentage of students scoring Proficiency on Mathematics assessment increased by .6% from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year. The percentage of students scoring Proficiency on Grade 5 Science assessment decreased by 1% from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year.

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

Based on 2019 state assessment data, the greatest need for improvement is the area of ELA and Mathematics for African American/Black students. In addition, 2019 state assessment data also shows a need for improvement in the area of 5th Grade Science.

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

Students experienced learning loss due to school closure and lack of face-to-face instruction during COVID-19 Pandemic. We implemented a new reading intervention Level Literacy Intervention (LLI) daily during intervention time for ELA. (45 minutes)

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

The number of students scoring at Proficiency increased from 2018-2019 School year from 57% to 65% in ELA.

The number of students scoring at Proficiency increased from 2018-2019 School year from 65% to 75% in Mathematics.

The number of students obtaining Learning Gains in ELA decreased from 2018-2019 64% to 59% in ELA.

The number of students obtaining Learning Gains in Mathematics increased from 2018-2019 65% to 75%.

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

2nd Grade instructional teacher transitioned with students from 2nd grade to 3 grade. Therefore, the teacher knew achievement gaps and was able to provide continuous instruction to address student needs.

The use of LLI intervention for ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains.

We have implemented a Math intervention program called Foundations for Math

Even students that have met proficiency and are doing well in Math or Reading have the opportunity to receive enrichment and be challenged academically.

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

We have a dedicated Paraprofessional who will provide the LLI intervention to students during 45 minute intervention time.

We have purchased the entire LLI curriculum with all grade levels to assist more students.

In order assist students in the area of Science, District STEM Coach is providing assistance to Science teachers and modeling in the classroom on a weekly basis.

Hands on learning activities weekly have been implemented in our Science classes.

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.

BEST Standards professional development

Expectations for all teachers

Science Professional development

LLI Professional Development

Wonders Professional Development for Reading

K12 Lift for Data Analysis Professional Development

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

Continue with Math intervention to fill in achievement gaps in Mathematics.

Science teacher has been identified as lead to continue with STEM activities to ensure sustainability. She has been working closely with District STEM Coach.

Principal and Reading Coach will continue to do classroom walkthroughs and observations to ensure intervention time is used correctly.

Monthly strategies are being modeled and monitored by Principal and Reading Coach to implement in the classroom to address cooperative learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Learning Gains decreased from 64% to 59% from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021 school years.
Measurable Outcome:	70% of students will make Learning Gains in ELA for 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Administration will conduct monthly data chats with teachers to ensure teachers are analyzing data and using it to drive instruction and provide student interventions. Classroom walkthroughs using Observe for Success to provide teachers with feedback concerning instructional practices. Data chats are conducted with students by teachers once after every progress monitoring assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data driven small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers are able to target specific learning needs of students and address them with appropriate interventions. Teachers are able to provide intensive instruction to remediate skill gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze FSA data and previous years progress monitoring data.
2. Complete schoolwide progress monitoring assessment
3. Established a schedule for our Paraprofessional which allows her to assist with student interventions.

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science FSA score decreased by 7 percentage points from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021 school years.
Measurable Outcome:	65% of Students will score proficiency on FSA Grade 5 Science for the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	Teacher observations using Observe Success for Science Teacher. Use of USA Test Prep 3 times a year for progress monitoring and standards specific assessments. Lesson plans will be reviewed weekly by Administration.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Project based-instruction (STEM Activities) Co-Teaching with District STEM coach
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hands on learning has been proven by research to increase student achievement. STEM coach is an expert in the field and will provide support to the teacher to ensure student acceleration takes place.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data analysis in area of Science by STEM Coach and teacher
2. Developed a schedule for STEM activities instruction

Person Responsible Amanda Brown (amanda.brown@mcsbfl.us)

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.

N/A

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.

Lee Elementary School provides a supportive and positive culture. Students are recognized for exhibiting positive character traits as set forth in our PBIS. Students can earn Star Bucks when they are exhibiting these behavior characteristics of the month. At the end of the month, the teacher draws 3 students from those that were exhibiting the behaviors during the month. The Principal then rewards these students from each classroom. From these 3 students, the Student of the Month is chosen. Pictures are taken and posted on Class DOJO of the monthly winners. They are also posted on a bulletin board in the cafeteria. Staff members are included in decisions. This provides a purpose for the staff members and gives them buy-in. This ensures that all staff members know that they are valuable and play a crucial role in every aspect of the school and ALL of the students.

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

Teachers
Students
Families
Volunteers
Churches
School Board Members
Counselors
Business Partners

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: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00