

Leon County Schools

Killearn Lakes 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

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/killearnlakes>

Demographics

Principal: Jenny Bla IR

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2007

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)	27%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (65%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Leon 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

Killearn Lakes Elementary School

8037 DEER LK E, Tallahassee, FL 32312

<https://www.leonschools.net/killearnlakes>

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	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 Leon 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.

Killearn Lakes Elementary School provides students with an equitable learning environment to create and develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Killearn Lakes will be an engaging, safe, and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

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
Wagner, Brenda	Principal	The leadership team sets high expectations for teaching and learning. The leadership team leads the school community in communicating and implementing the school's vision. Specific responsibilities include: Financial administrator, parent and community communication, data collection and communication, staffing plan manager, lead administrator in site-based decision making
Ricciardi, Champayne	Assistant Principal	The leadership team will identify resources to increase data driven decision making to support high quality instruction. Specific responsibilities include: parent and community communication, data collection and communication, faculty and staff professional development, lead administrator in site-based decision making in absence of principal
Crowe, Lisa	Reading Coach	Monitor student data, provide professional development to teachers, observe and provide feedback on teaching practices, provide reading interventions to students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2007, Jenny Bla IR

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.*

3

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

773

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

9

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

9

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	114	111	137	117	147	132	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	5	15	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	3	3	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Thursday 7/7/2022

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	108	122	110	142	144	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	3	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	108	122	110	142	144	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	764
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	3	8	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	75%	57%	56%				83%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						69%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						53%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	73%	47%	50%				84%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%						74%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						57%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	57%	59%				76%	52%	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	88%	61%	27%	58%	30%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	57%	24%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	56%	25%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

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	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	90%	66%	24%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2022					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	76%	54%	22%	53%	23%
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	52	54	47	60	50	56	62				
ASN	83			82							
BLK	81	81		55	40						
HSP	67	53		78	43	27	75				
MUL	75			81							
WHT	76	65	64	73	57	44	78				
FRL	73	70	67	60	53	30	88				
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	55	75	60	55	44		40				
ASN	94			94							
BLK	70	53		58	47		47				
HSP	71	55		66	36		82				
MUL	78			78							
WHT	79	72	60	75	49	47	79				
FRL	58	45		55	38		71				
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	45	51	38	52	49	36	38				
ELL	64			82							
ASN	92	78		88	89		85				
BLK	63	67	64	63	53						
HSP	86	62		86	54						
MUL	81	70		88	70						
WHT	85	69	49	85	75	55	79				
FRL	70	60	47	67	61	42	59				

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	65
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	454
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
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	57
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	78
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	65
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	63
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?

ELA: The percentage of students scoring level 3 and above is steadily declining.

The percentage of students making Learning Gains is steadily declining.

The percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making Learning gains is steadily increasing.

Math: The percentage of students scoring level 3 and above stayed the same as the previous year, but had dropped significantly from the test two years prior.

The percentage of students making Learning Gains increased this year, but had dropped significantly from the test two years prior.

The percentage of students in the Lowest 25% making Learning gains increased this year, but had dropped significantly from the test two years prior.

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

Although our scores stayed the same or improved this year in Math, when looking at the last three years data (2019 to 2022) there is an 11% decline in achievement, a 19% decline in Learning Gains, and a 13% decline in our lowest 25% demonstrating learning gains.

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 greatest contributing factor would be the loss of direct instruction due to quarantining for Covid.

Having a math intervention teacher who could pull small groups to remediate deficit math skills would significantly impact student growth in math.

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

Although math and ELA learning gains both show a 6% increase over last year, in looking at a three year trend math learning gains of the lowest 25% still reflect a 19% decrease. Therefore, our most substantial area of improvement was our lowest 25% in ELA with an 11% improvement over the last three years.

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

We implemented the ESE inclusion teaching model for grades 2-5 allowing for two teachers or a teacher and a para in one classroom for math and ELA instruction, reducing the student teacher ratio and allowing for more small group instruction. We provide an after school academic support program (LEAP) to assist students in mastering math and language arts standards. Our students scoring below the 10th percentile in reading received small group, intensive remediation.

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

Collaborative planning within grade levels and subject areas to focus instruction on new BEST standards and provide differentiated instruction that moves student learning to their potential. More time will be spent in small group instruction and authentic reading experiences.

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 be given additional planning days to collaborate and plan rigorous lessons that address the BEST standards. Professional Development will be provided for maximizing the benefits of Lexia Core 5. Monthly data meetings will be held to review student data and make instructional changes accordingly.

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

Ongoing professional development will be provided by the school and district in best practices for inclusion, math and ELA instruction, and data driven instruction.

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 Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In looking at the three year trend, the math learning gains reflect a 19% decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for 2022-2023 is to increase learning gains in math to at least 60% on FAST.

Monitoring:

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

We will use the FAST Progress Monitoring assessments and STAR Math to monitor student progress throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Explicit, systematic instruction coupled with visual representations (manipulatives and illustrations) in math concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Research has indicated that teaching mathematics in this manner is highly effective and can significantly improve a student's ability to perform mathematical operations. Research also shows that students who use visual representations to solve math problems are more likely to solve them correctly.

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.

We will have monthly grade level meetings during which we will study our data and discuss evidence based instructional strategies to remediate areas of need.

Person Responsible

Champayne Ricciardi (ricciardic@leonschools.net)

#2. 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.**

The percent of students scoring three or above in ELA has decreased eight percentage points since 2019.

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

Our goal for 2022-2023 is to increase the percentage of students who score a three and above to 80% on FAST.

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

We will hold monthly grade level meetings to examine our data, identify areas of need, and discuss evidence based instructional practices to address areas of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Crowe (crowel@leonschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:****Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Explicit, systematic instruction in small groups.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:****Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.****Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The National Reading Panel (NRP) report (2000) identified five areas essential to effective early reading instruction: (1) phonemic awareness, (2) phonics, (3) fluency, (4) vocabulary, and (5) comprehension. For older readers, we would adjust the five essential areas in the NRP's report to include these five areas: (1) word study, (2) fluency, (3) vocabulary, (4) comprehension, and (5) motivation.

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.

We will hold monthly grade level meetings to examine our data, identify areas of need, and discuss evidence based instructional practices to address areas of need.

Person Responsible

Lisa Crowe (crowel@leonschools.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.

The school meets the varying social-emotional needs of its individual students through a variety of programs and services. The guidance counselor holds mini-sessions to help small groups of students process emotions such as anger or grief. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) team brings together the school psychologist, social workers, behavioral specialists, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders to identify the social, emotional, and academic needs of students and pair them with appropriate interventions and other pupil services.

-All members of the school faculty participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally

and formally. Collaboration occurs across grade levels and content areas. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance.

-We have an active PTO that connects school faculty and staff with parents in less formal environments through activities such as Fall Festival, Volunteer Appreciation luncheons, the Fun Run, and PTO meetings. We have grade level representatives who share what their students are working on, have done, and plan to do each month at the PTO meetings.

-Teachers send weekly newsletters to families to ensure they are aware of all that is going on in the classroom and school as well as opportunities to volunteer. The school sends monthly newsletters to our families and posts them on our list serv for community members.

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

The principal and assistant principal work to provide a wide variety of opportunities for families and community members to interact with the school.

The principal, assistant principal, and guidance department have open door policies where faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members are welcome at all times.

Parent and community concerns are addressed as quickly as possible.

Our PTO works hard to connect community members with the school in a variety ways.

Teachers regularly teach lessons on social emotional skills to help students learn about one another and how to navigate interactions with one another.