

Duval County Public Schools

# Seabreeze Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

## Demographics

**Principal: Aimee Kimball**

Start Date for this Principal: 5/10/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	54%
<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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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](http://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

---

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

# Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">35%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">33%</p>

## 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 Duval 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 Seabreeze Elementary, we aspire to build a foundation for lifelong learning by fostering individual growth. We provide unique opportunities for developing leadership skills, critical thinking, and creative expression. We want our Seahorses empowered, prepared and fulfilled.

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

Seabreeze Elementary strives to provide a positive, engaging and thoughtful environment that will reach the whole child every day.

### 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
Kimball, Aimee	Principal	All
Troy, Ronrica	Assistant Principal	School Assessment data and Student Discipline data
Romer, Rebekah	Teacher, ESE	Gifted Education
Begnoche, Kelly	School Counselor	Student Counseling Services
Brewster, Natalie	SAC Member	
Reimer, Kathleen	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 5/10/2017, Aimee Kimball

**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.*

7

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

33

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

482

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

5

**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	89	71	88	89	80	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	3	14	16	16	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	3	2	22	16	15	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	2	5	23	23	24	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Thursday 7/29/2021

**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	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	89	71	88	89	80	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	3	14	16	16	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in ELA	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	3	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	3	2	22	16	15	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	2	5	23	23	24	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

**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	3	5	22	16	19	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

**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	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	1	0	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				75%	50%	57%	68%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				72%	56%	58%	52%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	31%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				79%	62%	63%	75%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				78%	63%	62%	58%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	52%	51%	41%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				64%	48%	53%	68%	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	74%	51%	23%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	72%	50%	22%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	57%	20%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	49%	13%	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.

The progress monitoring tool used by grades K-2 are iReady Reading/Math. In grades 3-5, the progress monitoring tool used was district Reading/Math/Science Progress Monitoring Assessment.

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		35%	55%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged		19%	18%	36%
	Students With Disabilities		14%	59%	62%
	English Language Learners		0%	33%	33%
		Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter
Mathematics	All Students		21%	43%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged		4%	18%	29%
	Students With Disabilities		7%	29%	67%
	English Language Learners		33%	33%	33%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39%	62%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	42%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	33%	56%
	English Language Learners	33%	67%	67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19%	48%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3%	22%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	22%	67%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	67%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	70%	68%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48%	48%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	27%	55%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64%	70%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29%	48%	41%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	64%	64%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	50%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	65%	78%	68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	54%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	50%	33%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	65%	66%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	50%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	13%	22%
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64%	73%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	59%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	22%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70%	68%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	59%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	22%	22%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	71%	81%	69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	73%	52%
	Students With Disabilities	50%	38%	22%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**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	34			48							
BLK	35	64		38	55		50				
HSP	81			81							
MUL	58			50							
WHT	79	71	45	84	75	55	75				
FRL	55	45		56	55	40	59				
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	40	69	63	44	72	71	29				
ELL											
BLK	52	65	60	55	77	82	31				
HSP	81	83		81	83						
MUL	86	80		79	70						
WHT	79	71	52	83	78	64	71				
FRL	62	70	70	66	77	70	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	41	38	31	50	57	42					
BLK	37	38	40	49	48	50	50				
HSP	61	60		78	60						
MUL	44			56							
WHT	79	56	31	83	66	42	79				
FRL	50	37	28	63	59	45	52				

**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	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
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%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	81
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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	69
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?

Science proficiency improved from 64% to 69%.

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

The 2 components with an area of decline is the area of ELA and Math. ELA decreased from 75% to 67% and Math decreased from 79% to 70%

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

The contributing factor for this need for improvement was the COVID Slide. The actions that need to be taken are to look at assessment data to determine the percentage of students that were proficient, gains and lowest performing quartile.

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

Science proficiency (64% to 69%)

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

Targeted instruction and data analysis were contributing factors for this improvement. In addition, the teacher that taught Science had primarily been an ELA teacher. The strategies for ELA were incorporated into classroom instruction.

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



1. ELA/Math/Science achievement: expected goal is to achieve 70% or higher in proficiency for each academic area.
2. Maintaining our school grade without any areas of decline
3. Improving culture and climate data as evidenced by our 5Essentials survey

**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 professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders will be determined by a needs analysis. The professional development opportunities will take place in common planning and early release. Teacher leaders will be used for each subject area: ELA/MATH/Science and Data Analysis. District Based professional development opportunities will take place at the school or district location

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

We utilize all instructional support personnel to push in and provide academic interventions. The instructional support personnel will consist of Varying Exceptionalities teachers, Instructional Paraprofessionals, and Instructional Coach. The services that each group will provided will involve placing identified students in targeted small groups. (instruction and progress monitoring)

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Other specifically relating to Improve Math and ELA proficiency**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Due to a decline in proficiency in ELA (75% to 67%) and Math (79% to 70%), Seabreeze will focus on both content areas.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Seabreeze Elementary will use Standards Walkthrough Tool as a data point. This will target areas of focus through common planning, early dismissal training, and coaching cycles.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The area of focus will be monitored through walkthroughs, formal and informal observations, lesson planning, and analysis of student data.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Seabreeze Elementary will incorporate brain-based Thinking Maps professional development, integrating the material with each grade level's ELA and Math curriculum.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers are in Year 4 of implementation for this program, and are eager to apply it across the content areas.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Meet monthly to plan and prepare engaging lessons through the use of Thinking Maps.
2. Track Baseline data and track growth throughout instruction through use of PMAs
3. Monitor and reward use of online lessons.

**Person Responsible**                      Aimee Kimball (kimballa@duvalschools.org)

**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.

**A primary area of concern is Physical Attack. The statewide rank is 700 out of 1395, county rank is 33 out of 97, and per 100 students is 0.38. The school culture and environment will be monitored through the PBIS team. PBIS will look at data to determine initiatives to implement school wide such as restorative practices, peace circles, etc.**

### 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.

For building a positive culture and climate, school leadership will focus on team building exercises, opportunities for empowerment and building relationships. The goal is to align our resources, mission, and people towards a common collective good. Our school increased in four out of five areas on the 5 Essentials survey. We hope to attain a "green" status in at least two domains in the upcoming year. Additionally, we hope to restore our Model School status this year (21/22).

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

School Leadership will analyze the following data point: attendance, academic performance, discipline and 5 Essentials data (student, teachers, parents) By analyzing the data, this will help to determine how to address these area and monitor for improvements.

Teachers will have the opportunity to be a part of the positive culture and environment through leadership opportunities. The will include being on the school-wide leadership team, lead professional development in common planning and early dismissal. Teachers will have the opportunity to input and decision making areas that effect their classroom and school.

Parents having their voiced heard and allow them to share their thoughts and ideas from a parents perspective through SAC, PTA, and other events. It will help parents feel valued and respected.

Students can provide ideas on positive behaviors, expectations about their learning, and ways to enhance their learning experience. It will build relationships with all community stakeholders and improve culture and school environment.

### Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Improve Math and ELA proficiency	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>