Oakridge Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oakridge Elementary School

1507 N 28TH AVE, Hollywood, FL 33020

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Eduardo Aguilar

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Broward 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

Oakridge Elementary School

1507 N 28TH AVE, Hollywood, FL 33020

[no web address on file]

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	Yes	81%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 Oakridge Elementary School is to develop an effective learning environment through strong relationships between teachers, staff, parents, business partners, and members of the community. We believe that all students can learn in a safe, standards-driven, technologically advancing, and culturally diverse school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All stakeholders at Oakridge Elementary will collaborate to provide a safe, happy, loving educational environment in which high quality instruction, social emotional learning, and positive behavior development is provided for all families and stakeholders. We, the students and staff of Oakridge Elementary will work together to help one another reach our fullest potential.

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
Aguilar, Eduardo	Principal	*Review and Analyze Data *Facilitate leadership team to utilize the information collected through the data analysis and develop a plan for improvement. *Budge funds in a way that supports the plan. *Oversee implementation and evaluation of the plan. *Provide feedback to teachers and support staff members responsible for implementing the plan. *Provide professional development opportunities. *Communicate SIP with all stakeholders.
Thornberry, Andrew	Assistant Principal	*Overseeing the completion of the plan. *Assist leadership team with implementing components of the plan. *Review and Analyze Data *Facilitate leadership team to utilize the information collected through the data analysis and develop a plan for improvement. *Budge funds in a way that supports the plan. *Oversee implementation and evaluation of the plan. *Provide feedback to teachers and support staff members responsible for implementing the plan. *Provide professional development opportunities. *Communicate SIP with all stakeholders.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Eduardo Aguilar

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.*

0

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

473

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

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	73	77	69	65	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	422
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	11	5	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	10	26	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	41	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	3	3	33	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

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	73	66	80	77	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	430
Attendance below 90 percent	56	45	38	41	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	73	66	80	77	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	430
Attendance below 90 percent	56	45	38	41	35	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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				40%	59%	57%	33%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	60%	58%	52%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	54%	53%	46%	51%	48%
Math Achievement				35%	65%	63%	38%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				46%	66%	62%	40%	60%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	53%	51%	32%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				31%	46%	53%	29%	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	34%	60%	-26%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	62%	-23%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	59%	-21%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	28%	65%	-37%	62%	-34%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	67%	-29%	64%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	64%	-30%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	28%	49%	-21%	53%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

For grades 1 - 5, the following progress monitoring tools are used for English Language Arts and Mathematics:
In English Language Arts (ELA), we utilize BAS and i-Ready Standards Mastery data for formative progress-monitoring, and for summative progress-monitoring we utilize i-Ready Diagnostic data.
In Mathematics (MATH), we utilize Think Central Personal Math Trainer (PMT) data for formative progress-monitoring, and for summative progress-monitoring we utilize i-Ready Diagnostic data.
For grade 5, the following progress monitoring tool is used for Science:
We utilize the disctrict created Science Pre-requisite, Mid-year, and End-of-year assessements.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30%	27%	10%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	25%	11%
	Students With Disabilities	31%	35%	0%
	English Language Learners	14%	13%	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20%	26%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	23%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	41%	-
	English Language Learners	29%	13%	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15%	35%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	32%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	13%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	6%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	19%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	20%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	7%	33%
	English Language Learners	7%	13%	-

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35%	34%	45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34%	31%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	32%	32%	28%
	English Language Learners	25%	13%	30%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16%	24%	13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	22%	10%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	17%	25%
	English Language Learners	10%	5%	18%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26%	28%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	28%	20%
	Students With Disabilities	22%	22%	16%
	English Language Learners	11%	11%	-
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	24%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11%	24%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	17%	0%
	English Language Learners	22%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25%	30%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	25%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	50%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	30%	0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	25%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	8%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	Science Pre-Req	Science-Mid	Science-EOY
	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	8	31		7	15						
ELL	30			17							
BLK	21	33		14	37		22				
HSP	28	32		22	36		30				
FRL	23	33	45	16	36	60	22				

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	26	47	50	25	49	47	17				
ELL	43	63	77	39	45	50	45				
BLK	29	48	47	26	43	53	14				
HSP	51	61	71	43	50	29	44				
WHT	40			33	40						

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
FRL	39	54	60	34	46	42	27				
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	16	32	27	25	32	33					
ELL	16	79		36	58						
BLK	24	39		30	31	38	30				
HSP	37	58	48	43	47	33	32				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	33			21	20						
FRL	33	51	45	38	39	33	31				

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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	272
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	12
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	25
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	32
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas, trends are appearing that Tier 1 instruction is in need of improvement. This is especially true in our Economically Disadvantaged and SWD students. Our ELL students perform better.

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

Based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessment data, 4th grade mathematics requires the greatest need for improvement.

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

Our 4th grade students have been largely effected by the Covid-19 Pandemic. The actions that will be taken will be regular remediation of the foundational (fluency) standards and concepts in order to strengthen the students' mathematical levels of understanding.

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

Based off the progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, the data that showed the most improvement was the area of Mathematical Learning Gains in our Low Quartile students.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement was a mathematical action plan focused on strategic interventions for our lowest quartile students. Foundational and fluency standards, in both current grade level and previous grade levels, were regularly remediated in order to build students' levels of understanding.

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

Oakridge Elementary has added two reading resource teachers utilizing ESSER grant funded positions. In conjuction with Title I, we have grown our Literacy Department. The staff in these instructional positions will be used to supplement reading instruction via a push-in and pull-out reading intervention model.

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.

In addition to the district professional development for the new reading resources, our Literacy Coach is providing support via team meetings to model lesson planning and modeling lessons in classrooms.

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

Strategic curriculum plans in English Language Arts, Mathematics, and Science are being implemented in order to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond. The plans are standards-based, and focus on current and previous grade level standards as a means of building students' levels of understanding.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Upon reviewing the 2021 FSA Data, it was determined that students needed intensive intervention in the area of reading to improve proficiency and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By 2022, 62% of our students will demonstrate learning gains in ELA as measured by the FSA.
Monitoring:	Curriculum coaches will meet on a weekly basis to monitor assessment data (iReady, BAS, formative assessments etc.) and discuss strategies to implement in order to support teaching and learning in the classroom.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Raixa Rafuls (raixa.rafuls@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are being provided Tier 1 instruction, as well as Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, in accordance with the MTSS/RtI process.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This specific strategy has facilitated 84% learning gains at Oakridge when implemented with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

Our Literacy Coach will oversee the department and personnel to ensure all students' ELA instructional needs are being met. Administration will meet with Literacy Coach and Literacy department as needed to ensure instructional practices and student learning is being monitored for efficacy.

Person Responsible	Raixa Rafuls (raixa.rafuls@browardschools.com)

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.

Our primary and secondary areas of concern are violent incidents and public order incidents respectively. Our school culture and environment will be monitored through referral data, staff observations / input, and student levels of learning as measured by formative and summative data.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Our school addresses building a positive school culture and environment through various stakeholder groups. A positive behavior plan to reward those students doing the right thing is being implemented. Students are also being rewarded for academic successes through incentives donated from stakeholder groups outside of the school. We are also utilizing our SAC committee to build a supportive environment for our students, as well as re-building our school PTA to continue supporting that initiative.

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

Stakeholders include:
- Students = positive behavior, WISE Ways
- Teachers = CHAMPS, WISE Ways
- Staff = WISE Ways
- SAC (parents and staff): providing input, feedback, and support of school and student initiatives/programs/ etc.
- PTA (parents): providing input, feedback, and support of school and student initiatives/programs/etc.
- Business partners: providing services and donations

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$2,462.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6200	369-Technology-Related Rentals	0461 - Oakridge Elementary School	General Fund		$2,462.00
					Total:	$2,462.00