

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ballast Point Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ballast Point Elementary School

2802 W BALLAST POINT BLVD, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ann Marie Russo Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 1/19/2017

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
2021-22 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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: 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	N/A
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ballast Point Elementary School

2802 W BALLAST POINT BLVD, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	25%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

Building
Unstoppable
Lifelong intrinsic
Learners
Differentiating for
Our
Growing
Students of the world

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students for Life

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hastings, Beth	Principal	
Homza, Oksana	SAC Member	SAC Chair
King, Telia	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 1/19/2017, Ann Marie Russo Gonzalez

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

21

Total number of students enrolled at the school

447

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

8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

8

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	0	6	6	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	5	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on 2022 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	2	2	8	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 9/2/2022

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	68	78	75	80	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	3	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	13	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	68	78	75	80	76	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	444
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	3	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	13	12	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	5	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	77%	53%	56%				73%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						68%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						31%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	79%	50%	50%				74%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	78%						77%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%						61%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	59%	59%				73%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	69%	54%	15%	56%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	84%	57%	27%	64%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	71%	51%	20%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	45	39	33	66	65	55	55				
ELL	54			46							
HSP	67	68	60	71	75		70				
MUL	71	60		93	90						
WHT	84	70	54	83	76	70	74				
FRL	51	66	47	63	78	71	59				

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	58	33		54	40		36				
ELL											
BLK	33			33							
HSP	67	30		62	55		33				
MUL	81			81							
WHT	81	56		77	41		66				
FRL	49	28	40	42	23		16				
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	50	38	35	54	47	44				
BLK	24	20		35	50						
HSP	51	55		60	72	58	61				
MUL	79	79		83	86						
WHT	87	77	46	83	81	70	86				
FRL	47	43	20	54	64	44	56				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	88
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	63

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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 FSA data from 2019 and FSA data from 2022, our students in 3rd, 4th & 5th grade made a 4% growth on ELA Achievement and a 5% growth on Math Achievement. Our ELA students in the Lowest 25% doubled from 31% in 2019 to 63% in 2022. This year we did not have any low performing ESSA Subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the data, we will continue to focus on learning gains and lowest 25% for ELA. We have closely monitored our Black/African American Students subgroup over the years and during the 2022 school year we did not have enough students to report - this year we currently have 14 students enrolled in 3rd & 4th grade.

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 contributing factors for this need is that last year we did not have enough students reported and we are wanting to be proactive as state testing is changing this year and we want to plan for the future.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2022 Science Standards Assessment, our 5th grade students made a 21 point gain from the previous year.

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

During the 2020-2021 school year, our 5th grade teacher that typically has taught Science taught virtually due to COVID. During the 2021-22 school year, she was back in the classroom fulltime teaching science to all the 5th graders through hands-on science stations. Also, our students in 3rd and 4th grade are receiving more hands-on instruction with science stations which allows them to have a better understanding of the curriculum by the time they are tested.

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

Students were scheduled according to their individual needs, students that need small group instruction were placed with our Gifted students so that when they are pulled out for math or reading the rest of the class is smaller to allow the teacher the opportunity to provide the accelerated learning to fill in the gaps.

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.

This year we have two teachers that are in a Teacher Talent Developer unit so that they can are able to provide support for our teachers through planning and implementation. We also have created a team of teachers that have analyzed the data to determine trainings that will help our staff become stronger math teachers.

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

As we continue to grow our teachers, they will become a resource to each other and continue to use strategies that were successful in previous year and monitor students closely.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Standards have changed for all grade levels as well as the curriculum and assessments that are being used this year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

80% of the students in Grades 3-5 will score a Level 3 or higher on the BEST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Grade Level PLC meetings bi-weekly to discuss student progress
2. Professional development and support from our TTD
3. Informal Observations
4. Progress Monitoring Assessment windows - Fall, Winter, Spring
5. Acceleration in all classrooms

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Hastings (beth.hastings@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Acceleration
2. ELP/ESY
3. PLC's
4. Learning Walks
5. Informal Observations with feedback
6. Student Conferencing and goal-setting

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Acceleration
2. ELP/ESY
3. PLC's
4. Learning Walks
5. Informal Observations with feedback
6. Student Conferencing and goal-setting

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Acceleration - All instructional staff
2. ELP/ESY - Instructional staff/Administration
3. PLC's - Team Leaders and Administration
4. Learning Walks - Administration
5. Informal Observations with feedback - Administration
6. Student Conferencing and goal-setting - Teachers and Administration

Person Responsible

Beth Hastings (beth.hastings@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Standards have changed for all grade levels as well as the curriculum and assessments that are being used this year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

82% of the students in Grades 3-5 will score a Level 3 or higher on the BEST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

1. Grade Level PLC meetings bi-weekly to discuss student progress
2. Professional development and support from our TTD
3. Informal Observations
4. Progress Monitoring Assessment windows - Fall, Winter, Spring
5. Acceleration in all classrooms

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beth Hastings (beth.hastings@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

1. Acceleration
2. ELP/ESY
3. PLC's
4. Learning Walks
5. Informal Observations with feedback
6. Student Conferencing and goal-setting

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

1. Acceleration
2. ELP/ESY
3. PLC's
4. Learning Walks
5. Informal Observations with feedback
6. Student Conferencing and goal-setting

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Acceleration-All instructional staff
2. ELP/ESY - Instructional staff/Administration
3. PLC's - Team Leaders
4. Learning Walks - Administration
5. Informal Observations with feedback - Administration
6. Student Conferencing and goal-setting - Teachers and Administration

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Ballast Point has multiple ways to reach out and involve all stakeholders:

- *Chats with the Principal (one per grade level)
- *Mentoring with Peter J. Mulry Foundation & Truist Bank
- *Monthly newsletters (Administration)
- *Weekly emails (Administration)
- *Weekly newsletters (Teachers)
- *Service Learning Projects
- *Fishing for Kindness initiative
- *Highly-involved PTA
- *Business Partners providing student incentives/services
- *Student Service Lunch Bunches with students
- *Administration Lunch Bunches with students
- *Restorative Practices
- *Anchored 4 Life Program

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

- *Chats with the Principal (one per grade level) - Administration
- *Mentoring with Peter J. Mulry Foundation & Truist Bank - Administration
- *Monthly newsletters (Administration) - Administration
- *Weekly emails (Administration) - Administration
- *Weekly newsletters (Teachers) - Instructional Staff
- *Service Learning Projects - Student Services
- *Fishing for Kindness initiative - Instructional Staff/Administration
- *Highly-involved PTA - Instructional Staff/Administration
- *Highly-involved Dads' Club - PTA/Administration
- *Business Partners providing student incentives/services - PTA/Administration
- *Student Service Lunch Bunches with students - Student Services
- *Administration Lunch Bunches with students - Administration
- *Restorative Practices - All staff
- *Anchored 4 Life Program - Graybill & Rivera