Bryant Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bryant Elementary School

13910 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Elise Suarez

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	14%
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 (74%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (76%)
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 Hillsborough 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

Bryant Elementary School

13910 NINE EAGLES DR, Tampa, FL 33626

[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	No	10%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To provide the highest quality education for all students in cooperation with parents, business partners, and our community while preparing them for a successful future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bryant Broncos will be respectful, responsible, and caring while galloping to greatness.

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
Oberschall, Ellen	Principal	The principal promotes the improvement of teaching and learning at Mary Bryant. The principal creates a climate which fosters student and teacher growth.
Hennigan, Alexis	SAC Member	The chair is responsible for notifying members of upcoming meetings and votes. The chair will facilitate the SAC meetings and inform the SAC of relevant issues related to school improvement activities.
Krupa, Matthew	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists in promoting the improvement of teaching and learning at Mary Bryant. The principal creates a climate which fosters student and teacher growth.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Elise Suarez

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.*
7

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

Total number of students enrolled at the school

928

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

2

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

8

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	136	136	152	157	157	170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	908
Attendance below 90 percent	22	6	5	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	7	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	3	5	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 11/18/2021

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	103	145	148	145	161	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	103	145	148	145	161	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	6	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
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	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				82%	52%	57%	85%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	55%	58%	70%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	50%	53%	64%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				86%	54%	63%	87%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	57%	62%	70%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70%	46%	51%	67%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				81%	50%	53%	83%	51%	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	82%	52%	30%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	55%	27%	58%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	54%	28%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	90%	57%	33%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	60%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	80%	51%	29%	53%	27%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Schoolwide data tracker that contains data on:
K-5 ELA and Math: iReady scores
5th Grade Science: Science Formative

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52%	83%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20%	47%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	65%	89%	93%
	English Language Learners	64%	85%	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	70%	85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30%	51%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	79%	92%
	English Language Learners	50%	50%	100%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	84%	93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52%	61%	64%
	Students With Disabilities	83%	92%	96%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	79%	92%
	Economically Disadvantaged	37%	69%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	71%	90%	100%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76%	90%	93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	82%	87%	81%
	Students With Disabilities	82%	82%	91%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41%	70%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	54%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	69%	79%	90%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	78%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58%	70%	72%
	Students With Disabilities	85%	86%	88%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	67%	90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	50%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	73%	78%	93%
	English Language Learners	n/a	n/a	n/a

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60%	75%	82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66%	69%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	79%	84%	90%
	English Language Learners	36%	36%	36%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52%	65%	77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	46%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	67%	73%	83%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	74%	74%	n/a
	Economically Disadvantaged	64%	49%	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	83%	88%	n/a
	English Language Learners	6%	22%	n/a

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	50	50		59	56	50	42				
ELL	76	83		84	83		61				
ASN	95	90		100	100		100				
BLK	62			62							
HSP	80	76		83	53		72				
MUL	88	88		84	75		82				
WHT	84	78	73	87	76	63	72				
FRL	70	71		68	40		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**
SWD	41	35	21	52	64	43	25				
ELL	60	58		74	79	70					
ASN	89	67		98	97		87				
BLK	71	64		71	91						
HSP	75	75		75	73	64	77				
MUL	90	89		88	79		69				
WHT	82	64	51	86	79	70	82				
FRL	69	63	41	77	77	63	77				
	**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	44	50	53	45	60	61	42				
ELL	70	79		65	57						
ASN	95	87		96	72		93				
BLK	86			79							
HSP	73	65	56	77	59	67	54				
MUL	92	57		94	70		100				
WHT	85	70	64	86	72	68	83				
FRL	67	60	43	62	56	50	60				

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	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	77
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	97
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	62
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	73
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	83
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	76
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	62
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?

Improvements across grade levels and content areas from fall to spring.

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

ELA Learning Gains demonstrate 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?

E-Learning-students reading on a screen more than usual could be a factor. Also, not being able to differentiate as easily. Varying the reading medium and differentiating will address this need.

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

Overall math proficiency in i-Ready from fall to spring.

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

Tracking math monthly data. Students were able to get reliable and consistent feedback.

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

Differentiating and tracking using ongoing assessment.

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.

Virtual ELA Mini-PDs, B.E.S.T. Trainings available, walk throughs, Planning with the ELA/SS Instructional Guides virtual trainings

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

Careful planning and collaboration during grade level PLCs. Formative assessments to track student learning gains, ongoing data collection, and feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ongoing assessment for learning will provide data to teachers to inform instruction and make adjustments to meet the needs of students.
Measurable Outcome:	1. Formative assessments to track student learning gains will be monitored using grade level PLC minutes. 2. Classroom walk throughs and observations bu administration will provide data and feedback to progress monitor effectivemetss of assessments and differentiated instruction. 3. Feedback will be provided to grade level teams and teachers. 4. Ongoing data collection will be analyzed weekly to determine if adjustments are needed to be made.
Monitoring:	1. Formative assessments to track student learning gains will be monitored using grade level PLC minutes. 2. Classroom walk throughs and observations bu administration will provide data and feedback to progress monitor effectivemetss of assessments and differentiated instruction. 3. Feedback will be provided to grade level teams and teachers. 4. Ongoing data collection will be analyzed weekly to determine if adjustments are needed to be made.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	By tracking and using ongoing assessment during learning, teachers can differentiate instruction to students and maximize learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher plans note tools for assessment and student self-reflection. Systems used to monitor student performance are visible to provide clarity of instructional goals.

Action Steps to Implement

Consistent collaboration among the general education teacher and the SWD teacher while utilizing the collaborative teaching model.

Person Responsible Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)

Utilize the MTSS form as a tool to communicate about SWD and progress monitor the effectiveness of the interventions.

Person Responsible Ellen Oberschall (ellen.oberschall@hcps.net)

Monitor IEP goals through quarterly meetings with SWD teachers and general education teachers. Documentation of progress towards individual goals will be discussed, and data will be used to drive discussions.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

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 secondary area of concern that the school will monitor is bullying and harassment. This is the area where most of our "Violent Incidents" come from. This will be monitored through the Hillsborough County SEL Panorama Survey. The students completed this in the fall and they will repeat the survey in the spring.

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.

Character building lessons, Morning Meetings, and the development of relationships among younger and older students through the Buddy Reader classes will enhance learning.

1. Teachers will participate in a book study: Leader in Me
2. Ongoing Grade level PLC Collaborative Planning to create Morning Meeting lessons/ Social Studies lessons
3. Teachers will display leadership boards or other visuals to promote this goal.
4. Students will build an understanding and demonstrate leadership habits

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

-School Advisory Council
-PTA
-Families and community members

The above stakeholders do their part to add to the positive culture and environment by organizing fundraising events for good causes, celebrating students' individual and class victories, and helping the community.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**