Dickenson Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dickenson Elementary School

4720 KELLY RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brody Marisa

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2018

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (62%)
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

Dickenson Elementary School

4720 KELLY RD, Tampa, FL 33615

[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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

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

To promote and develop a mindset that everyone can learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering and preparing lifelong learners for a positive and successful future.

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
Brody, Marisa	Principal	Make schoolwide decisions, reflect on data, and academic / school supports
Coleman, Kelli	Teacher, ESE	
Duncan, Stefanie	Parent Engagement Liaison	4th Grade Math and Science Teacher
Grubka, Michelle	Math Coach	Math Coach-Supports teachers in the classroom and supports students
Mondragon, Maybelly	ELL Compliance Specialist	ELL Resource

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/10/2018, Brody Marisa

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.*
1

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
27

Total number of students enrolled at the school
565

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.
40

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	89	104	83	89	88	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	547
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	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	32	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	12	6	12	32	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	16	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/22/2022

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	97	86	73	100	100	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	553
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	2	2	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	25	9	22	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	5	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	97	86	73	100	100	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	553
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	2	2	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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	25	9	22	29	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128

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	5	9	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	47%	53%	56%				52%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						54%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						50%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	61%	50%	50%				72%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	81%						70%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%						57%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	59%	59%				43%	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	46%	52%	-6%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	67%	54%	13%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	67%	57%	10%	64%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	54%	4%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	53%	-14%
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	20	64	75	28	78	93	33				
ELL	42	68	68	61	78	67	37				
BLK	60	83		68	75						
HSP	46	72	76	60	80	72	46				
MUL				50							
WHT	37	60		62	89		50				
FRL	47	70	73	61	80	78	42				

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	9	29	33	11	19						
ELL	33	43	45	47	50	38	15				
BLK	21			17							
HSP	38	41	48	48	46	35	24				
WHT	44			36							
FRL	34	41	48	43	43	38	26				

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	17	37	33	28	47	50					
ELL	44	48	55	68	68	65	28				
BLK	57	53		67	76		42				
HSP	52	55	55	74	70	58	44				
WHT	38			54							
FRL	51	53	47	70	68	56	41				

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	66
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	526
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
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	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	50
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	60
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?

Students proficiency levels increased overall, bottom quartile made gains in all gains

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

SWD and Whites meeting proficiency for ELA
SWD meeting proficiency for 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?

Data analysis
Need for specially designed instruction for ESE students (brainspring, rewards)

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

Math and ELA gains and BQ gains

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

Data driven PD, collaborative planning, Data chats after assessments, collaborative teaching

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

Student data tracking
Collaborative planning
Individual teacher support
Core instruction walk throughs
Bottom quartile push-ins
Extended day instruction
ESE student designed 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.

Coaching cycles
Data tracking PD
Data chats
student data ownership

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

NA- listed above

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	SWD's aren't meeting proficiency in ELA and Math
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By May 2023, SWD students will increase there proficiency scores by 10% in ELA and Math.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Leadership member will be at each grade level collaborative planning session and notes being taken in the school One Note. Individual students will be tracking their own data, and monthly data chats will be held.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marisa Brody (marisa.brody@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Progress Monitoring through iReady, PMA's, and classroom data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Data needs to be monitored monthly to track progress. These assessments will be tracked by admin and teachers bi-weekly and every nine weeks with staff.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

K-2 Response to Intervention time built into each teacher's schedule daily.
SWD students will have specially designed instruction through Brainspring.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

3-5 Response to Intervention time built into each teacher's schedule daily.
SWD students will have specially designed instruction through Rewards.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

iReady, classroom assessments, easyCBM

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

iReady, classroom assessments, easyCBM

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitored through iReady diagnostics given 3 times per year as well as Progress Monitoring baseline and mid-year assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brody, Marisa, marisa.brody@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

iReady
easyCBM
district made assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Yes
iReady
easyCBM
district made assessments

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Math Coach and Reading resource to plan and do coaching cycles with teachers based on data throughout	Brody, Marisa, marisa.brody@hcps.net

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.

Schoolwide communication tool of class Dojo to help communicate with parents. This app translates to other languages to accommodate our parents and students i the ELL population. Staff uses this to share work with parents, upcoming events, and behaviors.
Administration uses Parent Link to communicate with parents about school and district events. Most paper communication is translated into Spanish.
PTA provides opportunities for meaningful parent involvement.
Our positive behavior schoolwide system is PBIS- monthly incentives and quarterly events.
Monthly staff incentives
Weekly iReady incentives
Monthly iReady incentives
Student of the Month
Marigolds (Encouraging other staff and employees by recognizing who is helping to instill a positive work environment.
Lunch room incentives

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

M. Friedman- Guidance (Student of the Month)
M. Grubka- Math Coach (iReady incentives)

M. Brody and J. Vo- PBIS monthly incentives, staff incentives, marigolds awards, parent link
Teachers- Class Dojo
Lunchroom incentives- Brody and Vo, lunch supervision, teachers
PTA- President