Argyle Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://aes.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Dimitra Mainer   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	56%
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 (65%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (62%)
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.

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

Argyle Elementary School

2625 SPENCERS PLANTATION BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32073

http://aes.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-5	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

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.

The mission of Argyle Elementary School is to equip students with the skills needed to forge the future's next discoveries, inventions, solutions, and adventures in a world of new possibilities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The School District of Clay County and Argyle Elementary School exist to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Mainer, Dimitra	Principal	The School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) is comprised of a teacher representing each grade level, including ESE and administrators. Each member is responsible for helping to make data-driven decisions based on student data and grade appropriate benchmarks and standards. The SBLT will collaborate on sustaining a learning environments conducive to the success of ALL students.
Brown, Easter	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Dimitra Mainer

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
48

Total number of students enrolled at the school
704

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

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	103	99	94	89	100	98	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	684
Attendance below 90 percent	24	22	17	19	20	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	12	16	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	17	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	12	16	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 10/1/2021

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	89	89	76	94	106	92	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	8	12	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	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	

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	89	76	94	106	92	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	651
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	8	12	12	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
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	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				65%	65%	57%	62%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	62%	58%	60%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	54%	53%	51%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	70%	63%	74%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	66%	62%	68%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	56%	51%	53%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	65%	53%	59%	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	69%	68%	1%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2021					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	72%	71%	1%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	72%	69%	3%	64%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	76%	64%	12%	60%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	63%	3%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data from the Spring diagnostic assessment was used to compile this data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			65
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			64
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			69
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			79
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students			65
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			51
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			62
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			51
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			59
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			39
	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	47	49	8	43	41	29	33				
ELL	46	62		38	31						
ASN	60			60							
BLK	50	54	20	43	42	60	43				
HSP	57	56	42	52	31	15	27				
MUL	69	55		55	36						
WHT	64	54	40	62	42	36	44				
FRL	49	50	27	48	45	45	24				

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	46	59	55	55	67	63	53				
ELL	56	54		67	93						
ASN	71	73		86	91						
BLK	52	63	67	67	66	69	60				
HSP	68	75	73	73	74	62	75				
MUL	79	87		67	64						
WHT	69	58	38	76	66	39	67				
FRL	59	65	67	68	68	57	65				

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	39	46	54	47	49	36	39				
ELL	79	80		79	80						
ASN	89	82		94	65						
BLK	52	61	48	71	73	58	37				
HSP	70	50		70	60	27	86				
MUL	68	59		73	63		82				
WHT	63	59	57	76	67	56	60				
FRL	59	61	54	73	71	57	57				

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	44
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	311
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	44
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	60
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	45
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	54
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	49
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	41
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?

Two of the lowest performing areas were 5th grade Math Proficiency at 40%, a decrease of 36% from 2019 Spring FSA and 5th grade Science at 38%, a decrease of 26% from 2019 Spring FSA. Lack of student discourse and work in small group settings did not allow students to demonstrate their of understanding which did not allow teachers to scaffold and differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students, particularly those students who were making necessary progress.

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

Proficiency and gains decreased across the board. Identifying and progress monitoring LQ was not in place in classrooms.

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

Taking into consideration that the 2020-2021 school year had its set of challenges resulting from the Covid 19 pandemic, there are other areas that could have been beneficial if implemented effectively. Effective use of data to plan instruction did not happen and contributed to this need for improvement.

Providing professional development around digging into data and using it to plan instruction will improve intentional and targeted teaching, ultimately increasing student achievement.

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

There was no improvement between the 2019 and 2021 Spring FSA scores. All data components decreased in 2021.

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

There was no improvement between the 2019 and 2021 Spring FSA scores. All data components decreased in 2021.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we will need to focus on being intentional with the creation of small groups. We will also need to establish clear learning targets and ensure related tasks align.

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.

Teachers will participate in training to support the use of the new reading curriculum and the integration of the new standards with a focus on our current Florida Standards. Our whole group PLCs will focus on the district's Vision for Instruction and the strategies used in the classroom to support student achievement.

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

-teacher leaders (leadership academy)
-New teacher program at the school level

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency on the FSA dropped from 72% proficiency in 2019 to 53% proficiency in 2021, a drop in 19%.
Measurable Outcome:	AES will increase proficiency in math by 9% resulting in a goal of 62% proficiency.
Monitoring:	AES will be utilizing quarterly benchmark assessments and Iready to monitor progress in all areas of math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through an increase in student discourse and collaboration, teachers will identify student understanding, leading to an increase in math proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing student discourse teachers will be able to identify and target students who do not comprehend math concepts. This will allow teachers to target individual student needs and address them during small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development with staff regarding student discourse

Person Responsible	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

During walk throughs the admin team will provide feedback regarding student discourse.

Person Responsible	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Through data chats with teachers we will identify students that are struggling with math concepts.

Person Responsible	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency on the FCAT dropped from 67% proficiency in 2019 to 39% proficiency in 2021, a drop in 28%.
Measurable Outcome:	AES will increase proficiency in science by 11% resulting in a goal of 50% proficiency.
Monitoring:	AES will be utilizing quarterly benchmark assessments, penda online learning tools, and classroom assessments to monitor this focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through an increase in student discourse and collaboration, teachers will identify student understanding, leading to an increase in science proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By increasing student discourse teachers will be able to identify and target students who do not comprehend science concepts. This will allow teachers to target individual student needs and address them during small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development with staff regarding student discourse.

Person Responsible	Easter Brown (easter.brown@myoneclay.net)

During walk throughs the admin team will provide feedback regarding student discourse.

Person Responsible	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@myoneclay.net)

Through data chats with teachers, we will identify students that are struggling with science concepts.

Person Responsible	Dimitra Mainer (dimitra.mainer@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.

During the 2020-21 school year, Argyle scored in the middle category for incident rank. As reported our students experienced difficulty with threat and intimidation incidents. We will support more positive interactions with peers through the use of conflict resolution strategies. Effective implementation of the PBIS program will result in a decrease in the number of our OSS consequences by 2%.

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.

This year our school re-introduced PBIS to our staff and students. This committee has worked on creating very clear expectations for all and have developed a reward system for good behavior.

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

All staff members will follow the flowchart of options before a behavior is sent to the office for an office referral. The last step for staff members before it becomes an office referral is to make sure parents have been looped in as an attempt to allow them to be part of the solution.

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: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00