

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Buckhorn 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Buckhorn Elementary School

2420 BUCKHORN SCHOOL CT, Valrico, FL 33594

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Corrie Heidt

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	49%
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: B (59%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (66%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Buckhorn Elementary School

2420 BUCKHORN SCHOOL CT, Valrico, FL 33594

[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	44%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	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 a learning environment where students feel motivated to achieve to the best of their abilities in order to become successful and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learners today. Leaders tomorrow.

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
Horn, Tara	Principal	Oversee all operations and instruction at this school.
Allen, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Anderson, Melissa	School Counselor	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Kieffer, Sara	Instructional Coach	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Horner, Amber	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chair Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Heidt, Corrie	Assistant Principal	Oversee operations at this school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Corrie Heidt

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

727

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.

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	106	100	112	137	113	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	690
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	7	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	13	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	16	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	3	3	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 9/2/2021

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	94	98	116	110	111	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	6	9	7	10	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	94	98	116	110	111	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	6	9	7	10	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	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	5	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				64%	52%	57%	64%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	55%	58%	59%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	50%	53%	49%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				64%	54%	63%	74%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	57%	62%	72%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	46%	51%	48%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	50%	53%	74%	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	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	51%	14%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady data, Formative Science assessments

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51%	77%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43%	67%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	59%	61%
	English Language Learners	14%	43%	43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39%	64%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0%	0%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	63%	85%
	English Language Learners	35%	51%	74%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	40%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	28%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	23%	37%	57%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	19%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22%	34%	64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	25%	56%
	Students With Disabilities	18%	33%	78%
	English Language Learners	7%	20%	7%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	56%	67%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49%	57%	68%
	Students With Disabilities	45%	50%	58%
	English Language Learners	36%	19%	62%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31%	54%	78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	42%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	32%	45%	62%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	20%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67%	78%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63%	67%	79%
	Students With Disabilities	59%	68%	77%
	English Language Learners	51%	63%	67%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24%	47%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18%	35%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	39%	58%
	English Language Learners	14%	34%	54%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65%	75%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59%	65%	73%
	Students With Disabilities	61%	68%	70%
	English Language Learners	43%	57%	76%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	50%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	45%	66%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	53%	68%
	English Language Learners	33%	53%	90%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51%	50%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44%	40%	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	46%	65%	N/A
	English Language Learners	0%	17%	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	36	42	54	40	43	18	29				
ELL	43	38		44	31		40				
ASN	75			92							
BLK	56			47	30		20				
HSP	57	48	36	59	50	25	56				
MUL	74			65							
WHT	68	59	69	68	51	18	50				
FRL	56	52	58	54	49	29	43				
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	33	52	49	41	48	50	34				
ELL	43	47	33	55	63	54	50				

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	69	67		81	83						
BLK	52	64		52	55						
HSP	57	53	44	64	60	43	54				
MUL	64	59		76	65						
WHT	68	66	63	63	55	40	70				
FRL	57	61	61	53	55	43	58				
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	32	49	45	41	52	36	52				
ELL	41	47		50	50						
ASN	75	67		81	92						
BLK	45	53		45	60		30				
HSP	60	57	39	66	61	46	58				
MUL	68	54		88	85						
WHT	66	60	57	78	76	52	88				
FRL	56	57	55	63	63	36	64				

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	45
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	84
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	38
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	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	70
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	55
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	51
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?

We tend to do well with our ESE students and push our lower students. Our core content is our focus area and we need to strengthen this.

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

Math learning gains dropped 14 percentage points. Science learning gains dropped 20 percentage points.

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

The bottom quartile for Math, where we were six percentage points below the state average. A unique cohort of students contributed to this trend. Focus on small group math instruction and school-wide focus on science vocabulary and LTI's.

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

The bottom quartile for ELA grew 6 percentage points to 55 percent in 2019. This trend was continued during the 19-20 school year on iReady.

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

We focused on small group instruction in Reading and our Reading Coach was in classrooms working with teachers and students.

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

We are implementing small group instruction and differentiation in the core, along with professional development on these topics.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers were trained on the new BEST standards during Pre-Planning. Our Instructional Coach will be taking on all subject areas and coaching/working with groups throughout the year.

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

All of the leadership team will be involved in working with groups of students throughout the school year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math scores went down and we realized that something drastic needed to change. Students tend to show more growth when instructed in a small group setting rather than whole group.
Measurable Outcome:	Our FSA Math Scores decreased significantly and we plan to raise student proficiency to 64%. We will be measuring the small group implementation throughout the year using walk-throughs, formals, and informals.
Monitoring:	We will monitor iReady scores, math monthlies, and small group informal assessments. The entire leadership team will be responsible for monitoring the small group progress. During PLC's, data chats, and report card reviews, student data will be discussed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tara Horn (tara.horn@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the books "Guided Math Amped" to complete a book study with grades 3-5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This book is evidence based and research based.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership attends PLC's to ensure linking of assessments and data

Person Responsible Tara Horn (tara.horn@hcps.net)

Leadership attends PLC's to ensure discussions are intentionally planned for and utilized during the lesson.

Person Responsible Tara Horn (tara.horn@hcps.net)

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.

Our current school's discipline data is low. Suspensions are minimal, and behavior incidences are handled in school with counseling and mental health follow ups.

The reason for the school's rating of "very high" on the website compared to the state is due to one particular student who had major trouble keeping his hands and feet to himself. The student had a Functional Behavior Assessment completed and qualified for services and no longer attends Buckhorn Elementary.

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.

- 1) Teacher and student incentives (Teacher Appreciation Week, Student Appreciation Week, Silly string your teacher, Principal for the Day, Limo Ride for reading minutes, food truck for staff)
- 2) A focus on building positive relationships with all stakeholders (business partners, spirit nights)
- 3) Community involvement (staff and students attend community events, new teacher orientations)
- 4) Classroom lessons on kindness and friendship (Counselor provides classroom lessons on kindness and friendship)
- 5) Lessons on Social/Emotional Learning (Counselor provides classroom lesson on social/emotional learning)
- 6) Staff are recognized for positive contributions to other staff and students ("shout-outs" with prizes when staff members recognize each other for positive contributions, staff wellness room being created to continue the culture of positivity)

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

Tara Horn, Principal - in charge of setting the overall tone of the school

Corrie Heidt, Assistant Principal - assists with setting the overall tone of the school

Melissa Anderson, School Counselor - assists with student culture and working with classrooms

All staff members are responsible for treating other with kindness and respect.

Business partners - being active members of the school and supporting the school with volunteerism and spirit events

PTA - sponsoring events throughout the year, supporting staff and students with grants

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00