

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Westchase 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Westchase Elementary School

9517 W LINEBAUGH AVE, Tampa, FL 33626

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Alexa Trafficante

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)	24%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (71%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Westchase Elementary School

9517 W LINEBAUGH AVE, 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	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

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.

Preparing Students for Life!

Provide the school's vision statement.

A successful school requires strong leadership in all aspects, including administration, teachers, staff, parents, outside community members, and students. Working together as a team, we will achieve the ultimate goal of having each child reach their full potential academically, socially, and emotionally, so they are fully prepared for the life that lies ahead of them.

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
Suarez, Elise	Principal	Leader of the school
Williamson, Kelli	SAC Member	SAC Chair, 1st grade teacher
Steel, Amanda	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Alexa Trafficante

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

859

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

5

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

7

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	137	150	147	138	146	143	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	861
Attendance below 90 percent	31	24	14	18	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	9	10	8	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	8	3	7	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	3	4	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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

Tuesday 1/11/2022

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	130	147	148	147	150	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	882
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	7	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	130	147	148	147	150	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	882
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	5	7	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
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	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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				83%	52%	57%	79%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	55%	58%	63%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	50%	53%	49%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				84%	54%	63%	80%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				75%	57%	62%	66%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	51%	49%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				74%	50%	53%	72%	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	81%	52%	29%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	83%	55%	28%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	54%	26%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

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	82%	57%	25%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	73%	51%	22%	53%	20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Progress Monitoring Tools used by each grade is iReady.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	148	148	148
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	22	22
	Students With Disabilities	16	16	16
	English Language Learners	10	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	148	148	148
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	22	22
	Students With Disabilities	16	16	16
	English Language Learners	10	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	148	148	148

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	147	147	147
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	14
	English Language Learners	11	11	11
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	147	147	147
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	14	14	14
	English Language Learners	11	11	11
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	137	137	137
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	23	23
	Students With Disabilities	19	19	19
	English Language Learners	9	9	9
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	137	137	137
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	23	23
	Students With Disabilities	19	19	19
	English Language Learners	9	9	9

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	147	147	147
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	30
	Students With Disabilities	18	18	18
	English Language Learners	10	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	147	147	147
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	30	30
	Students With Disabilities	18	18	18
	English Language Learners	10	10	10
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	142	142	142
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	23	23	23
	English Language Learners	3	3	3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	142	142	142
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	23	23	23
	English Language Learners	3	3	3
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	142	142	142
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	31	31
	Students With Disabilities	23	23	23
	English Language Learners	3	3	3

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	39	29	21	47	71	62	29				
ELL	77			81			90				
ASN	97	93		95	75		94				
BLK	64			71							
HSP	74	59		74	71		71				
MUL	81	83		85	92		71				
WHT	83	72	48	88	87	78	82				
FRL	62	41		62	50		22				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	46	53	45	51	52	33	27				
ELL	58	54		71	71						
ASN	96	85		98	93		67				
BLK	83	62		68	46		60				
HSP	67	59	55	64	57	41	46				
MUL	79	58		88	83						
WHT	86	70	65	88	80	67	88				
FRL	62	55	50	64	61	53	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	41	38	29	48	53	35	28				
ELL	56	50	36	72	53		70				
ASN	86	65		94	61		82				
BLK	53	55		60	55						
HSP	65	51	39	66	59	42	58				
MUL	82	75		80	30						
WHT	84	67	63	85	73	48	79				
FRL	57	56	43	58	55	50	49				

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	72
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	91
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	68
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	67
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	82
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	77
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	47
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?

In Math, 3rd-5th grade are scoring 85% in achievement, 82% in learning gains, and 69% in the lowest 25th percentile. In Reading, 3rd-5th grade are scoring 81% in achievement, 72% in learning gains, and 46% in the lowest 25th percentile. The science achievement of 5th graders is 79%. Students with Disabilities are scoring significantly below students without a disability in Reading achievement, Reading learning gains, Reading bottom quartile, and Science achievement. Free and Reduced lunch students are also scoring significantly below other students in Reading learning gains, Math learning gains, and Science achievement.

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

The area demonstrating the greatest need for improvement is ELA Lowest 25th Percentile.

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, many of our students who fall into our lowest 25th percentile did not obtain the full instruction they needed over the last year and a half due to many contributing factors including online

learning, quarantines, lack of student interactions due to social distancing, etc. To improve this area, continued focus on obtaining proficiency in foundational skills and grade level content through small group instruction is important. Access to on grade level content and instruction is also imperative to ensure students have many opportunities to become proficient throughout the year. We are also progress monitoring and responding to this data collected throughout the year to ensure we are specifically meeting the needs of each individual student.

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

The area with the most improvement was Math. Math learning gains increased by 7% and the lowest 25th percentile increased by 15%.

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

We account these increases to the specific progress monitoring that occurred and responses to this data collected throughout the year. Through data chats on the progress monitoring, teachers and administration were able to determine specific needs of individual students and determine next steps to meet these needs. The teachers reviewed past content learned in that grade throughout the year based on these needs and the progress monitoring continued to assess their understanding of the content so students were exposed to it throughout the year. This provided great information and teachers responded to this information to support students.

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

Teachers will be using on grade level text during small group instruction and supporting students through scaffolding to accelerate learning.

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.

Coaching cycles, walkthroughs with feedback from administration, teachers observing each other, behavior and academic professional development as determined through walkthroughs and needs

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, fidelity walkthroughs, continuous professional support and development, and allowing opportunities for teachers, support staff, and administration to discuss progress and needs of students in all areas throughout the year will be implemented.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our bottom quartile continues to be of concern and we need to differentiate our instruction to meet the needs of all learners to ensure growth.
Measurable Outcome:	Our bottom quartile students showing proficiency will increase to above 50% on iReady and FSA assessments.
Monitoring:	We will monitor growth through iReady diagnostics, iReady growth monitoring, and Math Monthlies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elise Suarez (elise.suarez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiated small group instruction will be used to ensure growth.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With students in small groups, we will be able to differentiate appropriately.

Action Steps to Implement

Our AP will meet in data chats and PLCs with grade level teams to ensure fidelity.

Person Responsible Amanda Steel (amanda.steel@hcps.net)

Our PSLT will meet bi-weekly as well as three times a year in all day meetings to review data and plan for student achievement.

Person Responsible Elise Suarez (elise.suarez@hcps.net)

Our Reading Coach will be providing tiered instructional coaching and pulling small groups to ensure differentiated instruction and bottom quartile students show growth.

Person Responsible Elise Suarez (elise.suarez@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.

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org data, Westchase Elementary is rated as low for violent incidents. We will monitor threats/intimidation during the upcoming school year. We will continue our PBIS program to ensure we have a positive and inclusive school culture and environment.

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.

Due to Covid last year our school was not able to have events on campus or in person. Teachers held two conference nights talking with parents on the phone or by zoom. Parents are invited to join the School Advisory Council and all meeting dates and times are posted through the school newsletter. Parents can join the Parent Teacher Association which supports the school and the parents. The school also has community members that give support to our school. We have a school leadership team that keeps the staff informed on details for the school. Staff works together to help boost each other, especially during Covid.

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

Administration: Everyday business of the school

Leadership Team: Discuss school business and send the information out to the individual teachers on each team.

Staff: Working together to help each other

Parents: PTA and support to the school through classroom teachers and volunteering

Community Members: Financially support the school and give support to the school by volunteering.

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