

Manatee County Public Schools

Marjorie G. Kinnan Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Marjorie G. Kinnan Elementary School

3415 TALLEVAST RD, Sarasota, FL 34243

<https://www.manateeschools.net/manatee>

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Porco

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	78%
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: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Marjorie G. Kinnan Elementary School

3415 TALLEVAST RD, Sarasota, FL 34243

<https://www.manateeschools.net/manatee>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 2em;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.5em;">62%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 2em;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.5em;">67%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

Our mission at Kinnan is to foster success for all children, their families and the community by encouraging high academic standards in a positive, safe environment through hard work, personal responsibility, respect for others, honesty and cooperation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to improve achievement in reading, writing, math, science and build relationships and wellness for all.

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
Hockenbury, Paul	Principal	
Blackmore, Todd	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Melissa Porco

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.*

1

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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

256

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.

6

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	59	82	82	105	87	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	501
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/15/2021

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	75	95	92	93	75	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	24	26	23	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
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	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	

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	75	95	92	93	75	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	24	26	23	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
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	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	

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	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				52%	52%	57%	48%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	57%	58%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	55%	53%	44%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	63%	63%	56%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	68%	62%	51%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	53%	51%	40%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				39%	48%	53%	42%	49%	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	57%	51%	6%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	52%	-7%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	65%	-17%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	36%	48%	-12%	53%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-2 Iready % On Level and above
 Grades 3-5 Benchmark 1 and 2 and FSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	18	19	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	21	38
	Students With Disabilities	19	17	55
	English Language Learners	25	19	29
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	24	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	12	41
	Students With Disabilities	0	11	47
	English Language Learners	21	38	33

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	46	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	38	47
	Students With Disabilities	11	33	55
	English Language Learners	16.7	21	28
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	33	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	26	41
	Students With Disabilities	5	11	41
	English Language Learners	17	22	42

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46	45	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	52	47
	Students With Disabilities	11	11	23
	English Language Learners	35	26	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	49	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	46	
	Students With Disabilities	24	22	45
	English Language Learners	45	38	56

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	49	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	49	
	Students With Disabilities	18	18	29
	English Language Learners	42	45	53
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	53	55	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	50	
	Students With Disabilities	34	42	64
	English Language Learners	42	33	59

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48	50	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	39	46	
	Students With Disabilities	20	18	19
	English Language Learners	29	34	26
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	58	58	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	48	51	
	Students With Disabilities	17	27	24
	English Language Learners	54	49	38
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	39	34	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	17	
	Students With Disabilities	11	9	12
	English Language Learners	19	13	18

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	23	25		43	47		12				
ELL	39	41	50	49	55	75	24				
ASN	81			88			40				
BLK	42			65							
HSP	47	43	42	53	54	77	31				
WHT	57	46		72	73		67				
FRL	47	30	21	57	54	65	29				
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	24	44	50	37	47	45	25				
ELL	37	45	38	42	52	55	28				
ASN	63	58		79	67						
BLK	38	43		38	29						
HSP	46	46	43	45	48	54	26				
WHT	60	53	64	59	60	33	52				
FRL	45	48	49	45	48	49	36				
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	29	38	31	29	39	32	33				
ELL	24	40	37	46	44	29	7				
ASN	80	90		93	100						
BLK	39	36		39	55						
HSP	35	45	44	49	42	29	21				
MUL	57			62							
WHT	60	60	45	63	52	50	67				
FRL	45	55	46	51	54	39	36				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	49
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	75
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	54
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	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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	45
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?

Math up grades 3-5. ELA down grades 3-5 in all areas. Science has small gains.

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

Science

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

Contributing factors include, high rate of teacher absenteeism in testing grades, lack of science instruction, use of vocabulary in primary grades. Lack of science curriculum in all grade except 5th. STEM for grades 2-5. Creation of schoolwide science supply closet. Adoption of new science curriculum.

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

Math

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

Use of Acaletics program in grades 4 and 5.
Focus on grade level math planning grades 3-5.

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

Protect instructional time.
Reduce district testing to allow more time for teaching.
Regular reflection on student progression data.

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.

Train teachers on proper use of accelerated learning.
Train teachers on understanding Iready reports and using the toolbox to assigne targeted lessons.

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

This is a top down district. District level administration determines what schools do and how they do it.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA learning gains at the school level continue to be below the district and state average. Improvement in this area includes students from all subgroups including students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: ELA learning gains will improve by 5% as measured by the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: Monthly Ongoing Progress Monitoring meetings will be held with teachers to review student data and discuss interventions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: District curriculum maps and progression guides will be closely followed. All district selected curriculum materials and programs will be utilized with fidelity. Daily remediation will occur with students who did not show gains from the previous year. Monthly progress monitoring will take place to track student progression.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Fidelity to district curriculum plans will result in increased learning gains. Resources used: Wonders ela text, IReady, Accelerated Reading.

Action Steps to Implement

Accelerated Reading program will be used daily by students in grades 1-5. Students not participating in RTI will use this program each morning for 30 minutes.

Person Responsible: Arlene Velez (veleza@manateeschools.net)

Teachers will receive training on BEST standards and on implementing the Literacy Footprints curriculum.

Person Responsible: Todd Blackmore (blackmoret@manateeschools.net)

Small group instruction will take place in all classrooms during the ELA block in addition to 30 minutes of RTI tier 2 interventions for students who require them.

Person Responsible: Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA proficiency at the school level continues to be below the district and state average. Improvement in this area includes students from all subgroups including students with disabilities.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will improve by 10% as measured by the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring: Monthly Ongoing Progress Monitoring meetings will be held to review student data. Interventions will be discussed as needed. District benchmark data will also be used to monitor students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: District curriculum maps and progression guides will be closely followed. All district selected curriculum materials and programs will be utilized with fidelity. Daily remediation will occur with students who did not show gains from the previous year. Monthly progress monitoring will take place to track student progression

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Fidelity to district curriculum plans will result in increased learning gains. Resources used: Wonders ela text, IReady, Accelerated Reading, use of Imagine Learning with ELL students.

Action Steps to Implement

Same action steps as in the previous ELA goal.

Person Responsible Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science scores continue to decrease and fall below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	Science proficiency scores will improve by a minimum of 3% from 2021FSA scores. Improvement in this area will include student with disabilities.
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics science will be utilized in grades 4 and 5. IXL science will be used daily in grades 2-5. Teachers in grades 2-5 will meet bimonthly to plan science lessons and to incorporate science vocabulary and concepts into other portions of their instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful planning of science instruction at multiple grade levels should result in improved science scores for this year and future years. The IXL program is enjoyed by students and can be used at home as a way to extend science instruction. Science Acaletics, while new, will provide consistent science instruction to students in grades 4 and 5.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Kinnan elementary (0741) was not listed. Discipline data at Kinnan is favorable as incidents are infrequent and typical of an elementary school.

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.

Student expectations of honest, responsible, respectful, kind, and safe are woven through out the school. Students are rewarded when they are caught modeling on of these expectations. Quarterly award assemblies are held to recognize students who regularly demonstrate the expectations.

All staff are required to build relationships with students. All staff are utilized for check in/out with students as needed. We work to ensure that every student at Kinnan knows at least 1 adult well,

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

- Teachers
- Support Staff
- Administrative Staff
- Students

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00