Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://spc.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Larson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	53%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%)
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 Clay 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.](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

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary School

1630 WOODPECKER LN, Middleburg, FL 32068

http://spc.oneclay.net

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	No	65%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Swimming Pen Creek Elementary is committed to working collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide students with an educational experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to empower students by providing an innovative and engaging learning environment that prepares them for future success.

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
Lee, Chastity	Principal	The leadership team will create and monitor the SIP plan for the 2021-2022 school year.
Rodrigues, Brandy	Assistant Principal	
Van De Water, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	3-6 Math Department Head
Gelegan, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	Yearbook; Fundraisers
Holcombe, Courtney	Teacher, K-12	Parent and community involvement
Roy, Heather	Teacher, K-12	ESE Department Head
Dryden, Katherine	Teacher, K-12	Technology/ Social Media Department Head
Norton, Leah	SAC Member	Chair
Ferrante, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Hanson, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/27/2021, Cheryl Larson

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

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

415

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

0

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

1

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	60	66	62	70	54	57	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	415
Attendance below 90 percent	17	14	25	14	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
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	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Tuesday 9/7/2021

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	72	77	74	72	64	54	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	77	74	72	64	54	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	462
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	13	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	15	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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				63%	65%	57%	57%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	62%	58%	52%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	54%	53%	44%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				63%	70%	63%	61%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	66%	62%	57%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	56%	51%	37%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				71%	65%	53%	71%	66%	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	60%	68%	-8%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	64%	-21%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	54%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	69%	71%	-2%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	69%	-12%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	64%	1%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	70%	-18%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	63%	7%	53%	17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	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	36	53	54	50	76	73	46				
BLK	40			58							
HSP	73	90		59	50						
MUL	72			78							
WHT	74	77	50	77	60		81				
FRL	63	77		68	55		74				

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	48	63	57	49	59	43	50				
BLK	57	64	30	57	64		70				
HSP	64	72		58	63	55	58				
MUL	65	71		60	71						
WHT	65	67	68	67	61	44	75				
FRL	54	56	57	56	56	48	61				

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	36	38	32	43	42	33	65				
BLK	58	42		54	58		67				
HSP	46	60	50	51	47	40	70				
MUL	69	45		53	20						
WHT	58	52	41	65	63	42	78				
FRL	54	52	43	57	52	34	61				

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
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	49
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	68
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	75
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	
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	70
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	67
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?

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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.

.

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

.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 18-19 school year, student achievement and learning gains decreased 6%. As a school 49% of students that were identified as being in the lowest quartile made learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics is a core subject in which students must show proficiency in order the graduate high school and be college and career ready. If teachers identify and monitor students identified in the lowest quartile for remediation and targeted instruction based on data, then the percentage of students in the lowest quartile obtaining goals will increase .
Measurable Outcome:	Students will have FSA Math proficiency of 73%, math gains of 63% and lowest quartile gains of 77%
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by: - Walkthroughs and observations by administrators with feedback - Weekly PLCs with vertical teams and administrators - Monthly/ quarterly data meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will increase their capacity in mathematics teaching strategies in order to provide high quality lessons that are deeply engaging for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are provided with highly engaging lessons take more ownership in their learning which leads to higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement	
Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings with cohorts of teachers within their content area.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Teachers will participate in weekly walkthrough and feedback cycles with administrators.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Teachers will participate in monthly/ quarterly data meeting with their grade level teams and administration.	
Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 18-19 school year, Student achievement and learning gains increased as a school. However, 4th grade ELA achievement decreased significantly. ELA is a core subject that is used across all disciplines
Measurable Outcome:	Students will have FSA ELA proficiency of 71%, ELA gains of 76% and lowest quartile gains of 62%
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored by: - Walkthroughs and observations by administrators with feedback - Weekly PLCs with vertical teams and administrators - Monthly/ quarterly data meetings
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will increase their capacity in ELA teaching strategies in order to provide high quality lessons that are deeply engaging for students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are provided with deeply engaging lessons take more ownership in their learning which leads to higher student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will participate in weekly PLC meetings with cohorts of teachers within their content area.

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will participate in weekly walkthrough and feedback cycles with administrators.

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.net)

Teachers will participate in monthly/ quarterly data meeting with their grade level teams and administration

Person Responsible	Brandy Rodrigues (brandy.rodrigues@myoneclay.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.

.

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.

Using data from the 2020-2021 Climate Survey, positive school culture and environment are being addressed by keeping the needs of both students and staff in mind. For the students, a new positive behavior intervention support (PBIS) is in place to promote desired character traits and positive deeds. Students exhibiting the desired behaviors (optimistic, teammate, thoughtful, empowered, respectful, self-confident) will receive an Outstanding Otter Odyssey Form to deliver to an administrator. The administrator will call home to report the positive behavior. Brag Tags are a token given to the child as a reminder of the positive behavior. When a student receives so many tags, other incentives such as lunch with the principal, a gift card, or 30 extra minutes on Water Day will be awarded. When unfavorable behaviors occur, students will fill out a behavior reflection form to help them understand how their actions affect themselves and their peers. Reflection forms will be signed by parents so they can work alongside teachers to address the behavior and help the child get back on track toward earning brag tags.

To build a respectful and positive climate and culture among staff, everyone took the 16 Personalities Test to give insight into their personality type, traits, strengths, and growth opportunities. The test will allow the staff to reflect on the roles they play within the team. The book "Hard Hat: 21 Ways to Be a Great Teammate" by Jon Gordon will be read and analyzed by the staff to build positive and productive collaborations among colleagues. Professional Learning Communities have also been formed to allow teachers opportunities to work horizontally and vertically among grade bands to address best instructional practices within specific content areas using data to drive decision making.

Other ways the school fosters a positive environment is by hosting several events including Open House, Donuts with Dads, Muffins with Moms, STEAM Night, Winter Chorus Concert and Spaghetti Night, Spring Chorus Concert, and more.

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

The contributions of stakeholders promote a positive culture and environment at Swimming Pen Creek Elementary. Working alongside faculty members, the Parent Volunteer Organization (PVO) organizes events for families that not only brings the community together but also raises funds to support the school. Throughout the year, several Spirit Day events are held by business partners such as Maggie D's, Chick-fil-A, Chipotle, and Skate Station. Our YMCA partners hold Pryme Tyme on site at SPC to provide a safe environment for students needing before and after school care.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**