# Breakfast Point Academy

## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

# Breakfast Point Academy

601 N RICHARD JACKSON BLVD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

https://breakfastpoint.bay.k12.fl.us/

## Demographics

## Principal: Clint Whitfield                   Start Date for this Principal: 9/2/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Combination School PK-8 |
| **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) | 48% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (63%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northwest |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Rachel Heide |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

## 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

# Breakfast Point Academy

601 N RICHARD JACKSON BLVD, Panama City Beach, FL 32407

https://breakfastpoint.bay.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) |
|---|---|---|
| Combination School PK-8 | No | 61% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 29% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 9/28/2021.

## 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.**

Breakfast Point Academy will provide a positive and safe learning environment that fosters mutual respect among the community, staff, and students. We hold high expectations for our students as they grow into productive, knowledgeable, and responsible citizens.

One heart, one school, one vision...Every Ray, Every Day!

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

One heart, one school, one vision… Every Ray, Every Day! We believe in unlocking the leadership potential in every student in academics, relationships, and service to better prepare them for future successes.

### 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 |
|------|----------------|-------------------------------|
| Bailey, Janet | School Counselor | |
| Chester, Summer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Christopher, Rebecca | Assistant Principal | |
| Cryderman, Lisa | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Ficke, Amy | Teacher, ESE | |
| Jones, Robin | School Counselor | |
| Joyner, Amy | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Monduy, Elena | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Youngblood, Alex | Teacher, K-12 | |
| West, Erica | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Shumate, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Emery, Kendall | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Kelly, Mitch | Assistant Principal | |
| Rivers, Darnita | Assistant Principal | |
| Noble, Carolyn | Teacher, K-12 | |
| Webb, Shelly | Teacher, ESE | |
| Vines, Kathy | Teacher, K-12 | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Thursday 9/2/2021, Clint Whitfield

**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.*

6

**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.*

17

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

82

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

1,030

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

6

**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 | 81 | 87 | 93 | 133 | 114 | 116 | 122 | 144 | 136 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1026 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 14 | 17 | 26 | 23 | 30 | 25 | 34 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 213 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 29 | 12 | 30 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 28 | 6 | 26 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 101 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 4 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 6 | 13 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 |

**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 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

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

Friday 9/10/2021

## 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 | 102 | 113 | 123 | 107 | 107 | 105 | 144 | 126 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1041 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 | 16 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 22 | 27 | 33 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 23 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 35 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 30 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

## 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 | 102 | 113 | 123 | 107 | 107 | 105 | 144 | 126 | 114 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1041 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 30 | 16 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 22 | 27 | 33 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 218 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 14 | 30 | 23 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 35 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 92 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 30 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

## 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 | | | | 59% | 73% | 61% | 55% | 70% | 60% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 62% | 64% | 59% | 53% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 49% | 58% | 54% | 39% | 55% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 67% | 70% | 62% | 67% | 70% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 57% | 59% | 65% | 59% | 58% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 55% | 56% | 52% | 47% | 62% | 52% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 62% | 65% | 56% | 62% | 62% | 57% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 83% | 86% | 78% | 83% | 83% | 77% |

**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 | 57% | 61% | -4% | 58% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 58% | 2% | 58% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 56% | -8% | 56% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 56% | -2% | 54% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -48% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 54% | 5% | 52% | 7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 59% | 6% | 56% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |

| | | | | **MATH** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 62% | 11% | 62% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 64% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 54% | -8% | 60% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -60% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 53% | 0% | 55% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -46% | | | | |
| 07 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 59% | 10% | 54% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 63% | 48% | 15% | 46% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |

| | | | | **SCIENCE** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 52% | 54% | -2% | 53% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 51% | 15% | 48% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 80% | 74% | 6% | 71% | 9% |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 94% | 64% | 30% | 61% | 33% |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2021 | | | | | |
| 2019 | 100% | 62% | 38% | 57% | 43% |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Bay District Schools used Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) diagnostic data for the 2020-2021 school year.

| Grade 1 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 58% | 57% | 62/107 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 44% | 38% | 19/47 40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 43% | 43% | 10/23 43% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0/7 0% |
| Mathematics | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 63% | 62% | 67/107 63% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 44% | 22/47 47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 43% | 52% | 12/23 52% |
| | English Language Learners | 14% | 14% | 1/7 14% |

| Grade 2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 66% | 65% | 74/112 66% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52% | 49% | 26/51 51% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 44% | 42% | 11/24 46% |
| | English Language Learners | 67% | 67% | 4/6 67% |
| Mathematics | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 70% | 69% | 79/112 71% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 63% | 62% | 33/51 65% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 52% | 50% | 13/24 54% |
| | English Language Learners | 50% | 50% | 3/5 60% |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 56% | 54% | 68/127 54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 45% | 22/52 42% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37% | 34% | 10/27 37% |
| | English Language Learners | 10% | 8% | 1/12 8% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 67% | 64% | 83/127 65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52% | 51% | 26/52 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 52% | 48% | 14/27 52% |
| | English Language Learners | 30% | 25% | 3/12 50% |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 70% | 68% | 78/115 68% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 62% | 60% | 33/54 61% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 43% | 54% | 14/27 52% |
| | English Language Learners | 56% | 56% | 5/9 56% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 78% | 77% | 88/115 77% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 70% | 82% | 38/54 70% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50% | 85% | 12/25 48% |
| | English Language Learners | 89% | 78% | 8/9 89% |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 60% | 58% | 66/116 57% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 56% | 54% | 28/53 53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31% | 26% | 10/35 53% |
| | English Language Learners | 21% | 21% | 3/15 20% |
| **Mathematics** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 62% | 61% | 70/116 60% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 52% | 50% | 27/54 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37% | 31% | 12/35 34% |
| | English Language Learners | 36% | 36% | 5/15 33% |
| **Science** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | | 92/119 77% | 90/116 78% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 41/56 73% | 40/54 74% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 16/31 52% | 21/30 70% |
| | English Language Learners | | 6/14 43% | 6/15 40% |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 73% | 72% | 73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 65% | 64% | 65% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | 32% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 29% | 38% | 29% |
| **Mathematics** | **Number/% Proficiency** | **Fall** | **Winter** | **Spring** |
| | All Students | 59% | 60% | 61% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41% | 42% | 43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 39% | 37% | 39% |
| | English Language Learners | 43% | 50% | 43% |

| Grade 7 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 91/157 58% | 86/149 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 38/70 54% | 35/65 54% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 5/19 26% | 4/19 21% |
| | English Language Learners | | 7/24 29% | 7/23 30% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 59/157 38% | 60/150 40% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 25/70 36% | 25/66 38% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 1/19 5% | 7/26 27% |
| | English Language Learners | | 3/22 14% | 4/14 29% |
| **Civics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 8 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 80/133 60% | 76/122 62% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 23/49 47% | 25/46 54% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 6/26 23% | 8/24 33% |
| | English Language Learners | | 5/10 50% | 5/9 56% |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | 63/135 47% | 60/122 49% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 10/51 20% | 10/46 22% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 4/26 15% | 4/24 17% |
| | English Language Learners | | 3/11 27% | 3/ 9 33% |
| **Science** | 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 | 27 | 42 | 46 | 33 | 52 | 55 | 31 | 63 | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 59 | 61 | 30 | 68 | 83 | 50 | 70 | | | |
| ASN | 67 | 67 | | 89 | 67 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 36 | 50 | | 43 | 64 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 40 | 57 | 58 | 47 | 67 | 86 | 62 | 78 | | | |
| MUL | 65 | 55 | | 69 | 61 | | 64 | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 61 | 61 | 64 | 63 | 64 | 69 | 84 | 75 | | |
| FRL | 47 | 52 | 55 | 52 | 63 | 68 | 60 | 74 | 58 | | |
| **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 | 23 | 49 | 42 | 39 | 53 | 53 | 29 | 46 | | | |
| ELL | 39 | 72 | 67 | 68 | 74 | 63 | | | | | |

| 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 |
| ASN | 61 | 69 | | 83 | 85 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | 46 | 50 | 38 | 46 | 46 | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 57 | 52 | 62 | 52 | 44 | 47 | 81 | | | |
| MUL | 65 | 71 | | 67 | 64 | | 71 | 80 | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 63 | 49 | 68 | 57 | 61 | 64 | 86 | 77 | | |
| FRL | 53 | 60 | 46 | 58 | 54 | 49 | 53 | 79 | 64 | | |
| **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 | 24 | 37 | 31 | 35 | 46 | 38 | 32 | 57 | | | |
| ELL | 29 | 50 | 69 | 52 | 55 | 40 | | | | | |
| ASN | 58 | 71 | | 84 | 76 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 52 | 64 | 38 | 50 | 47 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 50 | 38 | 58 | 52 | 40 | 43 | | | | |
| MUL | 60 | 57 | 44 | 70 | 68 | | 63 | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 53 | 34 | 69 | 67 | 50 | 65 | 86 | 85 | | |
| FRL | 44 | 46 | 39 | 57 | 61 | 47 | 56 | 67 | 55 | | |

## 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 43 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 635 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 44 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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 | 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 | 57 |
| 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?

Historically we have seen that our lowest 25th percentile and our Students with Disability continue to show the lowest proficiency on district and state assessments. However, our progress monitoring data from the 20-21 school year saw significant gains for our SWD in both our current 4th and 5th graders. On the 4th grade ELA Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) diagnostic assessment we saw an 11 percentage points increase in scores from the Fall to the Spring. We saw the same gains with our 5th graders identified as Students with Disabilities showed a 22 percentage point increase on the ELA MAP scores from Fall to Spring.

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

In reviewing the comprehensive data we see that our students show consistent scores in nearly all areas as compared to previous years. Our scores and growth are evident as we maintained our "A" rating. One cohort that we see that appears to demonstrate a need for further focus would be our ELL population. We saw limited to no progress monitoring growth for our early elementary ELL students from the Fall to the Spring assessment.

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

Due to the many challenges our schools have faced in the 20-21 school year we are very pleased to see that our students have continued to demonstrate success. We are moving to iReady as a new progress monitoring tool districtwide. This tool will allow us to closely monitor our lowest 25th percentile along with our cohort groups including our ELL students. We also hope that implementing Imagine Learning with fidelity will help our ELL students. This program will provide targeted intervention and instruction at the students' level to address learning deficits. We believe that in addition to small group, differentiated instruction, this individualized skill based practice through iReady will provide remediation for our lowest performing students.

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

Overall our progress monitoring data showed consistent scores from Fall to Spring for our total population. We do see several areas of significant improvement on our MAP scores from Fall to Spring for our Students with Disabilities. Our first grade SWD showed growth on Math MAP from 43% to 52%, our 4th grade ELA showed growth from 43% to 52%, our 5th grade ELA showed growth from 31% to 53%, our 7th grade SWD showed a growth from 5% to 27% on Math MAP, and our 8th grade ELA SWD showed growth from 23% to 33%.

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

As a school we have ensure that our Students with Disabilities receive high quality instruction and intervention to meet their individual learning needs. Our students are supported in the general education setting with support from and ESE teacher at each grade level. We ensure that we incorporate a continuum of services and settings to best meet each student's individual needs. In addition to ensuring that all students receive grade level instruction, our SWD population receives small group instruction and remediation, accommodations in the classroom, and targeted interventions and skill practice through programs such as IXL and Fast Forward to address learning deficits.

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

Bay County had adopted a new ELA , Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, which is correlated with the new FL BEST Standards. This curriculum is designed to provide quality instruction on the new BEST standards through a gradual release model starting with whole group lessons then allowing students to interact with the text and practice the skills in small group and individualized activities. In addition the curriculum includes Table Top lessons designed to differentiate instruction in small groups and enables grade level texts to be accessible to all learners. In addition, the curriculum includes Table Top lessons for ELL students allowing them to access and interact with grade level texts and skills as well.

**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.**

Our district has provided on-going virtual trainings to support teachers in the implementation of the new curriculum. In addition, there are ELA Liaisons that receive in-depth training on the curriculum and all of the components including formative and summative assessments. The school's liaison will provide on campus support and training to all teachers.

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

In addition to the adoption of the new curriculum, our district has implemented a new Progress Monitoring program called iReady. This program will provide diagnostic data for all students K-8 three times per school year. This data will help drive instruction and will ensure that students in need are receiving the necessary interventions. In addition to the diagnostic tool, this program offers individualized instruction to address deficit areas. All students grades K-5 will have access to these individualized lessons that can offer both remediation and acceleration based on the students' needs. In grades 6-8 students that are in the Intensive Reading Course will also have access to the these individualized remediation lessons. In addition, our students identified ESE will have access to these lessons as well. iReady includes periodic "growth measures" so that progress can be more closely monitored for our students in need.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | We want to continue to implement classroom and school-wide expectations to improve the overall school culture for our students, teachers, and community. We believe it is very important that we focus on keeping students in class through restorative justice and character education. If students are not at school, they cannot learn. We will also dig deeper into our EWS data to identify at risk students who exhibit two indicators. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | As a school, we want to decrease office discipline referrals by at least 10% as measured by district data reports and FOCUS data. |
| **Monitoring:** | We will continue to implement our PBIS school-wide expectations and strategies in conjunction with restorative practices. We will also provide ongoing support to teachers and staff that assist in creating consistent responses to behavior as well as incentives that are appropriately aligned to PBIS expectations. We will also used CORE ESSENTIALS as our baseline character ed program. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | PBIS is a research-based program that, if implemented with fidelity, can help improve the school culture and cut down on office discipline referrals. We will also use restorative practices to foster relationships with students and parents in order to provide a multi-tiered approach to responding to student behavior. This is a continuation of last year's strategy as we saw a drastic dip in office referrals from the previous year to this year (934 total in 2018-19, 570 in 2018-2019, and 444 in 2019-2020). We did see a small increase in 2021-2022, but there were three students who had over 15 discipline referrals, and in order to move to case review, we used ODRs to document their behavior more formally. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based three-tiered framework for improving and integrating all of the data, systems, and practices affecting student outcomes every day. It is a way to support everyone, especially students with disabilities, to create the kinds of schools where all students are successful.- Center on Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports - pbis.org |

### Action Steps to Implement

The teachers will develop classroom expectations with their homerooms and keep those on display throughout the year. When necessary, the teachers and administration will use classroom and school-wide expectations to reteach and reinforce positive behaviors throughout the year.

| **Person Responsible** | Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

BPA has a plan for preventing and responding to behavior that outlines responsibilities and roles of teachers and administrators. All staff will be trained on their responsibility and roles. This training will include the three TIERS of Intervention.

| **Person Responsible** | Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us) |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | PLCs will focus on planning and preparation of BDS Pacing Guides while administration focuses on providing regular feedback and support through strategic coaching and CWTs. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our administrative team is assigned to different grade level and content area PLCs, which all meet on Thursdays. Our admin team will visit PLCs no less than 2 times a month, and review minutes no less than 3 times a month to provide feedback and engagement in assisting teams with planning and preparation around the BDS Pacing Guides. |
| **Monitoring:** | Each PLC has a folder in the Google Drive in which they keep minutes and information based on their weekly meetings. Each PLC is expected to update and upload their information into these folders for documentation and reference. Each administrator will become familiar with the Pacing Guides, and we will also reference those in our CWTs to ensure we are assisting teachers with staying on pace, providing grade level tasks and assignments, and engaging students in standards-based instruction. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We know that effective PLCs can improve teacher instruction through data and student work analysis, grade level planning and preparation, and collaborating on the best interest of the student. Ultimately, effective PLCs are designed to make the most impact on student achievement and growth. Our teachers will focus their PLCs on these components while also referring to the 4 essential questions that DuFour asks about students. It is also important that our PLCs remained focused on being student-centered. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Professional learning communities tend serve to two broad purposes: (1) improving the skills and knowledge of educators through collaborative study, expertise exchange, and professional dialogue, and (2) improving the educational aspirations, achievement, and attainment of students through stronger leadership and teaching. Professional learning communities often function as a form of action research, as a way to continually question, reevaluate, refine, and improve teaching strategies and knowledge. Meetings are goal-driven exchanges facilitated by educators. Our Professional Learning Communities will function based on the principles outlined in DuFour, R., DuFour, R. Eaker, R. & Many, T (2010) Learning by Doing (2nd ed.) Solution Tree Press |

### Action Steps to Implement

PLCs meeting regularly for planning and preparation of BDS Pacing Guides (Admin joining weekly on Thursday)

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us) |

PLCs will meet, at a minimum, once a week
All agendas will be distributed, a minimum of 24 hours in advance of a scheduled PLC
All meeting minutes will be housed in Google Drive

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us) |

| #3. Leadership specifically relating to Walkthroughs | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Our administrative team will utilize feedback cycles to teachers to ensure effective instructional practices and standards-based instruction are being implemented at Breakfast Point. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | The administrative team will engage in no less than 3 CWT feedback cycles with our specific PLC members throughout the school year. |
| **Monitoring:** | Utilizing a universal CWT walkthrough form, our administrative team will perform classroom walkthroughs with our teachers and provide feedback. We will use the digital form, based much on TNTPs guidance as well as the standards of rigor, to take notes and provide feedback to teachers. We will use a "notice and wonder" strategy to ask questions related to, but not limited to, content, instruction, environment, classroom management. We will then have a follow-up meeting with the teacher after the walkthrough, discuss the feedback and provide guidance for implementation as well as strategies and research-based practices, if necessary. We will then plan a return visit to see the strategies implemented, followed by another meeting to discuss progress. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | [no one identified] |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We believe that getting into the classrooms is important for many reasons, but we want our teachers to understand we are there to support them, as well as learn alongside them. Teachers appreciate specific feedback that is constructive, and we want to assist them in implementing strategies that will have the most effective and timely impact on student achievement, teacher growth, and school-wide consistency. It will also allow us to pair teachers together who have similar needs, and/or utilize teachers on our campus to assist others who may need assistance in implementing different instructional strategies. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Engaging in meaningful walkthroughs has been shown to benefit everyone involved including administrators, teachers, and our students. Some of the benefits of this practice include: <br><br> Administrators become more familiar with the school's curriculum and teachers' instructional practices <br><br> Administrators can gauge the climate of a school (Are students engaged? Are cross-curricular concepts a part of everyday teaching? Is there evidence of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all learners?) <br><br> A team atmosphere develops as teachers and administrators examine instruction and student motivation and achievement <br><br> Administrators establish themselves as campus leaders and instructional mentors, influencing teaching, learning, and ongoing school renewal <br><br> Students see that both administrators and teachers value instruction and learning. <br><br> Protherce, Nancy. "Using Classroom Walkthroughs to Improve instruction" Principal, March/April 2009, pp. 30-34. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

The Administrative Team will develop a plan for how and when walkthroughs will occur.
The Administrative Team will review the CWT form and share that form with the teachers.

**Person Responsible**   Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

The Administrative Team will conduct the walkthroughs based on the developed schedule.
Teachers will meet with the Administrator following the walkthrough for feedback and collaboration.

**Person Responsible**   Clint Whitfield (whitfcj@bay.k12.fl.us)

## 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.

**After reviewing the data, we are #131 of 313 combination schools in the state. We are #1 in the county for combination schools. We continue to see a decrease in Out of School suspensions as we implement restorative justice practices aligned with our PBIS strategies throughout the school. It is very important for us to intervene early with at or high risk students to problem solve and keep them at school.**

**We do see that our Tobacco incidents are on the high end, which those are centered around Vaping incidents. However, our Violent Incidents and Property Damage are on the low end.**

**Our primary area of concern will be reducing tobacco incidents and our secondary area will be reducing violent incidents.**

**We will continue our Character Ed initiatives through Core Essentials along with our restorative justice and PBIS practices. For any students with Tobacco incidents, we will seek out cessation information for them.**

## 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.**

Breakfast Point Academy uses a comprehensive approach to support positive relationships with parents and increase family involvement. We promote effective school-to-home and home-to-school communication about student progress, school events, educational programs including but not limited to social media, websites, LINK alerts, emails, bulletins, and our welcome marquee. We also keep our community informed via social media. Parents are encouraged to become active members of the Parent Portal student account. This is an up-to-date account of student attendance, grades, behavior, etc.

Because of COVID, and specific restrictions on volunteers and campus visitors, we are looking at innovative ways to continue community involvement. We are going to work with community partners to provide opportunities to for our students and staff that will define new areas of support and volunteers. We will work with our Volunteer Liaison to find new ways to provide parental and community involvement. We will continue to use our PTO as a community partner and connection to others to provide as much involvement as we can!

BPA promotes PBIS school-wide expectations as well as promoting character education through our Core Essentials program. Our school-based Leadership Team is involved with making important decisions about our school and community, and we also utilize our School Advisory Council to engage stakeholders.

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

The stakeholders are teachers, staff, students, and community members. It is very important to us as a school to promote and model positive, appropriate behavior with our students and staff. Our students follow the RAYS expectations in which they are expected to be Responsible, Accountable, Young Leaders, Showing Respect. We recite this every morning on announcements, and each classroom has schoolwide expectations and classroom expectations displayed in their classroom. We communicate our schoolwide expectations with our stakeholders outside of school as well because it is important for them to be privy to our expectations and intent for promoting positive behavior.

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Walkthroughs | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |