Limona Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Limona Elementary School

1115 TELFAIR RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marlou Bates   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)	97%
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 (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: A (63%)
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

Limona Elementary School

1115 TELFAIR RD, Brandon, FL 33510

[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	57%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

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.

Limona will build a positive, academically challenging and safe environment for students to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Limona students will be prepared to succeed in life.

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
Bates, Marlou	Principal	Monitor data, coach teachers, facilitate curriculum discussions, and provide professional learning opportunities
French, JeanMarie	SAC Member	Review data and provide teacher's with ELA resources as needed

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Marlou Bates

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.*
2

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
32

Total number of students enrolled at the school
597

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	91	93	108	115	86	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	9	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 12/2/2021

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	93	101	94	95	102	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	14	6	7	15	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	0	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	93	101	94	95	102	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	14	6	7	15	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	1	0	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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				66%	52%	57%	68%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				58%	55%	58%	56%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	50%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				69%	54%	63%	73%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	57%	62%	50%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	46%	51%	33%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				58%	50%	53%	55%	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	62%	52%	10%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	62%	55%	7%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	63%	57%	6%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	55%	51%	4%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1-5 -iReady
5 - Science Baseline

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47%	81%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	48%	69%
	Students With Disabilities	41%	69%	82%
	English Language Learners	86%	85%	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	70%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	36%	71%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	36%	51%
	English Language Learners	40%	0%	80%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	75%	84%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47%	68%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	62%	64%	57%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45%	68%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15%	39%	67%
	Students With Disabilities	39%	81%	90%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72%	80%	99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64%	76%	84%
	Students With Disabilities	0	50%	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	69%	91%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	59%	77%
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	21%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63%	87%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40%	51%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59%	72%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	42%	60%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	80%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55%	61%	72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	38%	45%
	Students With Disabilities	70%	50%	100%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	46%	61%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	41%	53%
	Students With Disabilities	72%	67%	93%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70.70%	74.21%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.7%	41.88%	
	Students With Disabilities	73.45%	57.85%	
	English Language Learners	0	0	

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			35			30				
ELL	48	55		52	45		27				
ASN	78			83							
BLK	45	48		39	38		32				
HSP	52	40		59	35		30				
MUL	79			93							
WHT	67	61		75	50		65				
FRL	51	48	35	59	40	44	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
SWD	27	27	19	42	41						
ELL	56	63	60	59	57	63					
ASN	93	82		93	92						
BLK	53	48	33	63	45		38				
HSP	63	60	42	57	51	52	55				
MUL	52	43		70	46						
WHT	75	61	30	79	51	29	69				
FRL	58	55	40	63	55	59	47				

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	19	35	33	54	47	40					
ELL	54	41	50	54	41	36					
ASN	86			93							
BLK	57	48	40	76	64						
HSP	62	50	63	66	45	39	60				
MUL	74	55		74	64						
WHT	71	61	47	74	45	13	49				
FRL	60	50	43	64	46	30	45				

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	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	383
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	90%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
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	81
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	40
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	44
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	86
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	64
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?

Based on the data, additional support is needed for Students with Disabilities, ELL, Bottom Quartile, and Tier 3 students in all subject areas.

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

Based on data, vocabulary and comprehension have the greatest need for improvement for ELA and number sense has the greatest need for improvement in math.

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

Lack of background knowledge in ELA and math contributes to the students' deficits. Teachers will use acceleration to help close the achievement gap and improve the deficiencies of students.

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

Based off of iReady data there was growth in all grade levels from fall to spring in both ELA and mathemetaics.

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

Teachers continued to focus on core instruction while accelerating through use of small group. Teachers provided small group instruction based on the areas their students showed a deficit through skill grouping and monitored their progress regularly.

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

Teachers will implement more accountable talk/discussion throughout core, student led discussion in small groups, and will use data to further drive instruction among grade levels to further drive instruction.

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 provided an overview on accountable talk and provided posters for their classrooms. A data team will further assist in deep dive data chats. During professional study day, acceleration training was provided to all content area teachers.

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

The district is supporting our teachers by providing DRTs support and ongoing content area PDs for teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on student data, teachers will continue to teach students how to use accountable talk with their classmates and use student led conversations in small group.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021 - 2022 school year, the percent of students in grades 3-5 making gains in the bottom quartile on the FSA ELA will increase from 33% to 50%. Our SWD students' will include an increase on the iReady spring diagnostic from 63% on or above grade level to 70% on or above grade level.
Monitoring:	The administrative team will conduct walkthroughs in the classrooms looking for accountable talk and student led discussion. Feedback on the walkthroughs will be shared with the teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady lessons will utilize accountable talk and student led discussions and improvement will be evident on diagnostics.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady will be used because it creates individualized learning paths for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teacher training for Accountable Talk and Student Led Discussion
2. Provide time for common planning to focus on standards and questioning
3. Provide ELP for reading
4. Provide differentiated instruction for students in reading and mathematics
5. Offer modified curriculum to meet the needs of SWD students

Person Responsible	Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lack of student growth based on FSA and iReady scores identified a critical need for a focus on data analysis by teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	Based on data from FSA, student learning gains will increase from 53% to 70% in ELA and bottom quartile will increase from 33% to 60% in ELA.
Monitoring:	Teams will turn in PLC notes reflecting their analysis of student data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Through Professional Learning Communities, teachers will review data from iReady and math monthly assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will analyze their data in PLCs with a data team member and be able to discuss students' strengths and weaknesses to improve core instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hold PLC/collaboration meetings bi-monthly with a PLC log to discuss/record RtI data. Share with PSLT to analyze data and trends, identify barriers, discuss best practices in providing interventions and progress monitoring of student growth.
2. Use iReady data to assist in identifying students with needs
3. Provide vertical PLC opportunities throughout the year

Person Responsible   Marlou Bates (marlou.bates@hcps.net)

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.

Behavior in primary classrooms will be monitored. Teachers will implement the schoolwide behavior plan with positive supports. MTSS team will monitor student behavior 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.

Teachers assist in decision making through our Steering committee that meets monthly. Additionally, all staff are encouraged to share concerns or ideas for improvement with administration. Parents can participate in our environment through becoming a member of our school SIP team and our school PTA meeting Events are planned throughout the school year to help encourage a positive school climate with parents, teachers and students. Students follow a code of conduct while staff encourage a positive culture through classroom/school behavior plan.

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

Teachers encourage and create a positive culture in the classroom. The administration team encourages a school wide positive culture in the school.

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: Professional Learning Communities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00