Deer Park Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Deer Park Elementary School

11605 CITRUS PARK DR, Tampa, FL 33626

www.deerpark.mysdhc.org

Demographics

Principal: Edith Lefler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	25%
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 (72%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (65%)
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

Deer Park Elementary School

11605 CITRUS PARK DR, Tampa, FL 33626

www.deerpark.mysdhc.org

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	23%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

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.

Deer Park will maximize student potential and provide them with the knowledge, skills, and character necessary for success in the 21st century.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deer Park will be the top performing school in Hillsborough County.

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
Lefler, Edith	Principal	Ensure the safety of all students and staff. Creating a positive school culture Creating a long term plan for student academic success Cultivating leadership in others Managing people, data and processes. Improving school leadership
Findley, Eric	Assistant Principal	Ensure the safety of all students and staff. Creating a positive school culture Creating a long term plan for student academic success Cultivating leadership in others Managing people, data and processes. Improving school leadership

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Edith Lefler

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

885

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

4

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

0

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	151	136	162	147	119	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	861
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	11	7	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/20/2021

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	122	162	146	134	152	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	2	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	14	17	19	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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	122	162	146	134	152	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	817
Attendance below 90 percent	6	8	2	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	14	17	19	15	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
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%	77%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	55%	58%	64%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				81%	54%	63%	78%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	57%	62%	76%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	46%	51%	54%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				79%	50%	53%	75%	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	84%	52%	32%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	55%	24%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2021					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	56%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	83%	54%	29%	62%	21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	86%	57%	29%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	78%	51%	27%	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.

iReady

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	73	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	57	78
	Students With Disabilities	31	51	75
	English Language Learners	26	28	56
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37	69	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	41	69
	Students With Disabilities	25	50	63
	English Language Learners	26	14	70

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67	83	92
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	71	81
	Students With Disabilities	57	83	79
	English Language Learners	50	70	70
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	78	97
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	56	81
	Students With Disabilities	30	70	83
	English Language Learners	10	50	90

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79	89	93
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	83	89
	Students With Disabilities	73	77	75
	English Language Learners	70	80	90
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	51	72	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	45	68
	Students With Disabilities	68	72	75
	English Language Learners	20	60	100

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	52	63	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	51	73
	Students With Disabilities	62	65	68
	English Language Learners	55	67	78
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	41	63	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	45	71
	Students With Disabilities	52	64	71
	English Language Learners	6	27	60

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	48	66	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	50	79
	Students With Disabilities	68	72	80
	English Language Learners	40	40	60
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	52	64	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	30	70
	Students With Disabilities	68	76	74
	English Language Learners	40	60	60
Science	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	70.7	65.35	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	50.7	53.41	45
	Students With Disabilities	87.2	86.8	0
	English Language Learners	29.6	56.47	42

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	48	40		44	70						
ELL	76	82		74	77		71				
ASN	90	83		95	91		96				
BLK	54			38							
HSP	69	67		69	60		58				
MUL	68			79							
WHT	79	53		76	55	27	65				
FRL	65	63		59	63	50	32				

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	25	29	16	30	44	45	20				
ELL	69	70	65	72	64	53	73				
ASN	92	75	73	93	83		93				
BLK	71	57		67	57		70				
HSP	71	66	57	66	71	61	68				
MUL	75	69		80	69						
WHT	85	71	59	84	76	52	83				
FRL	73	68	57	67	70	59	65				

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	22	46	50	27	42	29	36				
ELL	59	69	71	65	77	69	64				
ASN	90	81	70	93	84		87				
BLK	65	75		43	56						
HSP	68	54	48	67	74	63	74				
MUL	74	50		78							
WHT	77	62	57	81	77	52	73				
FRL	61	46	47	60	70	55	58				

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	64
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

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	75
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	87
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	46
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	65
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	74
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	62
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	57
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?

Students across all subgroups increased on level proficiency each testing period.

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

Math data did not have the same growth as reading. This is especially evident in upper grades.

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

Due to covid protocols it was difficult to do math rotations with consistency. Teachers are working on new ways to develop small groups.

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

Reading data had the most growth.

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

Most teachers are reading endorsed and implement strategies.

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

Utilizing acceleration strategies.

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 will work on in house PD to share strategies for small group targeted instruction.

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

Targeted ELP instruction. Targeted math instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2020-21 Panorama Student survey results showed that students felt they needed to work on self awareness and self regulation.
Measurable Outcome:	Student's social emotional learning will increase by implementing the 7 Mindsets model that provides strategies to change mindset throughout all aspects of a child's learning environment.
Monitoring:	Follow up PD's and classroom walkthroughs will provide insight into how each classroom teacher is implementing 7 Mindsets.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Cultivating a positive classroom environment and focusing on the 7 mindsets will provide learning opportunities to enhance social emotional learning and lifelong social emotional skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The student survey showed student's felt they needed support in social emotional learning. 7 Mindsets is a district promoted program that focuses on these specific skills.

Action Steps to Implement	
Faculty book study on 7 Mindsets	
Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
Teacher led trainings on strategies to implement 7 Mindsets in the classroom effectively.	
Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
Classroom implementation of 7 Mindsets including: Highlighting one of the 7 mindsets monthly, giving out Effort Awards using the Mindset theme, and weekly classroom lessons.	
Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
3 Mindset Assemblies during the year to introduce, celebrate progress and celebrate success in practicing the 7 Mindsets.	
Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student gain scores will increase in math by teachers focusing on small group instruction and differentiation strategies to meet the needs of all students. Rational: Student gain scores will increase when providing students with direct small group instruction that enhance learning for all students.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains will increase from 63 to 67.
Monitoring:	Grade levels will meet to monitor and discuss data monthly. Teachers will use iready assessments, progress monitoring data and classroom performance to look for trends, strengths and areas of focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboration among teachers and effective TLCs focusing on small group instruction strategies will increase math gains.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Content differentiating and small group creating will be discussed and planned during TLCs. Admin walkthroughs will help provide feedback and strategies to meet the need of all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Teacher led trainings focusing on small group instruction strategies

Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

Teacher classroom shadow walkthroughs with teaching peers

Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@hcps.net)

Partner with community business partner to enhance math focus.

Person Responsible	Eric Findley (eric.findley@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

SWD will be provided with small group instruction targeting math skills. Continuous data collection will be taken to ensure gains and to allow for differentiation.

Person Responsible	Edith Lefler (edith.lefler@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.

Deer Park reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls into the very low category of the school incident rating. As a school we will continue to monitor this data and ensure the school incident rating continues to stay in the very low category.

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.

Deer Park is implementing 7 Mindsets to address and build a positive school culture and environment. The 7 Mindsets have been designed to promote self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. As a school we are focusing on Internal motivation as opposed to external motivation. We want faculty and students to invest and build upon these skills throughout the year.

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

We included an introduction of Deer Park's plan to implement 7 Mindsets in our beginning of the year packet sent to parents.
School Counselors will send out monthly DoJo messages to parents education them about the 7 Mindsets and giving links to recourses.
Deer Park's SAC Committee will discuss and plan additional ways to include stakeholders and community members in implementing 7 Mindsets.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00