

Volusia County Schools

# Palm Terrace Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Palm Terrace Elementary School

1825 DUNN AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/palmtree/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

Principal: Karen Troutman M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (49%)<br>2018-19: D (39%)<br>2017-18: D (33%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TSI   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Palm Terrace Elementary School

1825 DUNN AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32114

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/palmterrace/pages/default.aspx>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 82%  |

### School Grades History

| Year  | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       |         | D       | D       |

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

In an environment of mutual respect and trust, the students, staff, parents, and community of Palm Terrace Elementary will actively share the responsibility of ensuring success for all children.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The community of Palm Terrace Elementary will make a positive difference in the lives of the students and families we serve but creating an environment of clear and high expectations where student and family voice is the norm. We we accelerate learning and increase student achievement by providing access to strong instruction, deep engagement, and grade level assignments.

### 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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Elliott, Stefanie    | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Miller, Madison      | Other               |                                 |
| Jordan, Angel        | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Jefferies, LaSherica | Teacher, ESE        |                                 |
| Troutman, Karen      | Principal           |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/31/2022, Karen Troutman M

**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.*

22

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

38

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

576

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

16

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

11

### 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                              | 72          | 105 | 103 | 121 | 76 | 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 546   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 29          | 19  | 12  | 23  | 17 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 107   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 8   | 16 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 5   | 6  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0   | 14  | 31 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 70    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0   | 13  | 30 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|  | 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           | 0 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

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 | 5 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022



**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                              | 98          | 90 | 104 | 96 | 52 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 540 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 77          | 32 | 31  | 25 | 13 | 30  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 208 |       |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0   | 10 | 3  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0   | 5  | 1  | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7   |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0   | 11 | 14 | 41  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 10 | 10 | 59  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 15          | 7  | 4   | 3  | 1  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33  |       |
|  | 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 | 10 | 8 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 51 |

**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     | 1           | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4  | 0 | 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                              | 98          | 90 | 104 | 96 | 52 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 540   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 77          | 32 | 31  | 25 | 13 | 30  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 208   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0   | 10 | 3  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0   | 5  | 1  | 1   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0   | 11 | 14 | 41  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 66    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0   | 10 | 10 | 59  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 15          | 7  | 4   | 3  | 1  | 3   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
|  | 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 | 10 | 8 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |

#### 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     | 1           | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4  | 0 | 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             | 34%    | 53%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 33%    | 56%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 57%    |          |       |        |          |       | 44%    | 56%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 47%    |          |       |        |          |       | 42%    | 46%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 40%    | 42%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 35%    | 59%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 67%    |          |       |        |          |       | 45%    | 56%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 66%    |          |       |        |          |       | 42%    | 43%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 33%    | 55%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 34%    | 57%      | 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 | 33%    | 58%      | -25%                       | 58%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 30%    | 54%      | -24%                       | 58%   | -28%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -33%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 30%    | 54%      | -24%                       | 56%   | -26%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -30%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 36%    | 60%      | -24%                       | 62%   | -26%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 28%    | 59%      | -31%                       | 64%   | -36%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -36%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 54%      | -19%                       | 60%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -28%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|         | 2019 | 31%    | 56%      | -25%                       | 53%   | -22%                    |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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                                       | 7        | 44     | 57          | 11        | 42      | 42           | 6        |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 34       | 59     | 50          | 38        | 67      | 64           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 29       |        |             | 36        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 45       |        |             | 50        | 70      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 58     | 46          | 40        | 68      | 63           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 11       | 40     |             | 11        | 35      | 30           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 43     | 50          | 33        | 34      | 23           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 21       |        |             | 21        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 38       |        |             | 47        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 47       |        |             | 67        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 42     | 47          | 36        | 36      | 28           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 13       | 29     | 29          | 14        | 36      | 27           | 6        |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 18       | 30     |             | 27        | 60      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 29       | 38     | 38          | 30        | 39      | 44           | 29       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 28       | 53     |             | 25        | 63      |              | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 58       | 67     |             | 53        | 47      |              | 55       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 41       | 56     |             | 49        | 56      |              | 38       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 33       | 43     | 41          | 35        | 44      | 41           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |

### 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)                 | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students         | 49  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO  |

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 2   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 344 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7   |
| Percent Tested  | 98% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 30  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 3   |
| 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  |     |
| 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                                 | 48  |
| 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   | 33  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   |     |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | N/A |
| 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   | 55  |
| 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                                | 48  |
| 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?

Palm Terrace has historically underperformed in ELA, noted especially when looking at proficiency levels. Science achievement also is recognized via trend data as an area for concern for the school with proficiency data consistently well below both the district and state assessment percentages.

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

Both ELA and Science, in terms of proficiency, show the greatest need for improvement. This is reflected historically over time in both state assessments and district assessments.

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

While Palm Terrace was working with external operators and undergoing transition as a D-ranked school, science was temporarily reduced in terms of minutes of instruction and explicit content with the exception of fifth grade. Low performing ELA proficiency scores are directly linked to the low socioeconomic status of the community with students in the community coming in with limited

background knowledge and low print concept scores as made concretely evident by trends in FLKRS data. Moving forward, science support from the district coupled with explicit science instruction using district resources will promote achievement and increase in proficiency scores. ELA proficiency will increase slowly over time with the addition of programs in the community such as Head Start and VPK, allowing students to make connections and increase background knowledge before entering Kindergarten.

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

Assessment data shows a major increase in the learning gains of lowest quartile students and overall whole student body. Palm Terrace showed an increase in gains in both reading and math. Math showed a dramatic spike in overall learning gains with an increase in 22 percentage points and within the Lowest Quartile subcategory with an increase in 26 percentage points.

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

Palm Terrace received support from outside factors (external operators - TNTF) to support teacher efficacy within the school. Collaborative planning, which occurs twice per week after school for one and a half hours, allows teachers to both align instruction to standards and meet the rigor of said standards, it also allows students to drill down to the data of the students and plan to meet those students' needs. Collaborative planning was closely monitored by leadership staff, including deliverable components with feedback.

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

Walk to Intervention will be implemented in primary grades as a pilot for whole school implementation by 2023-2024. Deliverables were modified and revamped to align to new curriculum and BEST standards with the collaborative planning structure overhauled to include support from district and school leadership personnel for a common message and mission. PLCs will be regrouped as horizontal grade-specific versus vertical subject-specific groupings to allow a sense of collective efficacy by cohorts of staff with teachers gaining voice and ownership through self-facilitation and team-driven agendas.

**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.**

The district will provide professional development of the new MTSS (multi-tiered systems of support) model to identify students who are tier 2 and tier 3 and creating interventions therein five times over the course of the academic year (once during a Professional Development Day, four times during Early Release Wednesday slots). The school, in conjunction with district transformation team staff, will provide the following PD opportunities: ELA PD focusing on small group instruction, Math PD focusing on new BEST standards and curriculum support, Science PD on best practices and models to implement and close achievement gaps and learning gaps, and a PD focusing on PBIS (Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports).

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

By the year 2023-2024, the vision is to incorporate a system that transforms the ELA intervention time reflected in the master schedule to be utilized as a Walk to Intervention, following the WIN model outlined in the book "WIN Time: Fearlessly Transforming Your School" by Morris Lyon and Stephanie McConnell. Additionally, science support from the district level will work 1:1 with out departmentalized 5th grade science teacher. K-5 Science teachers will receive explicit training with district-provided

resources and best practices for implementation that are evidence-based to drastically increase student achievement.

### **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 Standards-aligned Instruction****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Our area of focus is aligned to Strategic Goal #1 to engage all students in high levels of learning every day. As a result of our data analysis from our school grade, it reveals that our ELA proficiency is at 34% while our Science proficiency stands at 33%. Our school proficiency is below the state and district averages. Our most vulnerable populations were adversely affected as outlined in our ESSA area of concern.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our measurable goal is to increase proficiency in ELA from 34% to 45% and Science from 33% to 45%. Teachers will provide standards-aligned instruction as made evident by weekly submitted lesson plans and administrative walkthroughs.

**Monitoring:**

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored using specific walkthrough tools specifically for ELA and Science. Teacher lesson plans are monitored weekly with specific and timely feedback given by administration and content-based coaches. Coaching cycles will be implemented based on need. Student performance data will be monitored closely using both formative and high stakes, summative (district) assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Karen Troutman (kmtroutm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Teacher clarity, effect size of .75 according to John Hattie's meta-analysis and research, provides nearly two years' growth for student performance. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive clarity through feedback and coaching to provide clarity and input on student learning to determine next steps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Teacher clarity, effect size of .75 according to John Hattie's meta-analysis and research, provides nearly two years' growth for student performance. Grade level teams and individual teachers will receive clarity through feedback and coaching to provide clarity and input on student learning to determine next steps through collaborative planning by:

- Crafting learning intentions and success criteria.
- Co-constructing learning intentions and success criteria with learners.
- Creating opportunities for students to respond (i.e. formative assessment).
- Providing effective feedback on and for learning.
- Sharing learning and progress between students and teachers.

**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.

Conduct ERPLs on Questioning (Benchmarks), Small Group Instruction, and Science Content.

**Person Responsible** Madison Miller (mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate a Science Lab in the morning supervision schedule to build capacity and prior knowledge bank for students regarding Fair Game NGSSS.

**Person Responsible** Laura Konters (lnkonter@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct collaborative planning that includes planning for alignment between the standard/benchmark, the lesson, and the tasks. Planning will also include teachers "doing the work to know the work" to provide worked examples that illustrate desired outcomes for their students.

**Person Responsible** Anthony Copelin (amcopeli@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coaching cycles will be conducted on an as-needed basis to support teachers with standards-aligned instruction using evidence-based tools. Teachers will be tiered based on prior VSET, walkthrough data collection, and anecdotal evidence.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly Masters (kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups****Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

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

Our Area of Focus is aligned to the District Strategic Plan Goal #1: Engage all students in high levels of learning. Currently, Hispanic subgroup are performing at an index of 30 while our Students with Disabilities subgroup are performing at an index of 30. Both subgroups are performing well below the federal index of 41.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal will be to increase the overall index for our underperforming subgroups of Hispanic and Students with Disabilities from 38 and 30, respectively, to 41. By April, 90% of interventions in the classroom will be implemented with fidelity. By April, the number of tier 2 and tier 3 teachers needing support with interventions will decrease by 20%.

**Monitoring:**

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

The area of focus will be monitored through data tracking during PLC, specifically student performance on district assessments. We will monitor and provide feedback of lesson plans to include differentiation for all students. We will utilize ICEL to determine whether the need for improvement falls under challenges with instruction, curriculum, environment, or learner.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kimberly Masters (kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based****Strategy:**

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

Our evidence-based strategy is collective efficacy through PLC by having PLC be grade-level specific versus subject-area specific. Collective efficacy is defined by John Hattie as having an effect size of 1.57, which is nearly 4 years worth of growth. PD will be offered to teachers for better understanding.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Collective efficacy is defined by John Hattie as having an effect size of 1.57, which is nearly 4 years worth of growth. Collective Teacher Efficacy is the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effect size of  $d=1.57$  Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.

**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.

Conduct collaborative planning that focuses on team-specific interventions to improve student outcomes.

**Person Responsible**

Karen Troutman (kmtroutm@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Redesign PLCs to be lateral and grade level specific to reinforce the ideology that all teachers are responsible for all students. Teachers and instructional leaders will utilize progress monitoring from all district and state assessments and accountability tools therein to disaggregate our data and determining need to plan for continued student support.

**Person Responsible**

Kimberly Masters (kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will receive a minimum of four MTSS professional learning opportunities to align practices to include identifying students with deficits resulting in identification of tier 2 and tier 3 intervention support.

**Person Responsible** LaSherica Jefferies (ldjeffer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention System**

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

In 2021-2022, Palm Terrace recorded and documented 450 disciplinary events with 124 of which occurring in 1st grade, totaling nearly 1/3 of all referrals. 116, or 1/4, of the total number of referrals occurred in 2nd grade, and 177 occurred in intermediate grades (defined to be 3rd-5th). Because the bulk of referrals occurred in primary, we know we still have students who will remain on this campus for the next 3-5 years in need of support regarding behavior and incentivizing positive choices.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

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

Within the academic school year, Palm Terrace will decrease the number of referrals from 450 to 360, a 20% decrease. By April, 90% of behavioral interventions in the classroom will be implemented with fidelity. By April, the number of tier 2 and tier 3 teachers needing support with behavioral interventions will decrease by 20%. Teachers will be tiered based on prior VSET, walkthrough data collection, and anecdotal evidence.

**Monitoring:**

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored monthly in PBIS meetings. Discipline data will be shared monthly where a committee of teachers and staff will utilize and plan for implementation using best practices from both PBIS and AVID.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Angel Jordan (aljordan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

We will utilize AVID strategies and restorative practices in conjunction with PBIS supports in both tier 1 and tier 2 phases to offer tiered support as needed.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

PBIS is a research-based framework for implementing school-wide systems of behavioral support, in a tiered continuum based on student responsiveness to intervention, to help prevent and reduce undesired behavior and improve social and academic behavior outcomes for all students in a school. The two strategies used for focus this year are organization (binders) and engagement (community partnership through PBIS).

**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.

Conduct monthly PBIS/AVID meetings, inviting multiple stakeholders and utilize data to drive conversation and problem-solving.

**Person Responsible** Stefanie Elliott (slelliot@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct and attend AVID training for pertinent staff for implementation of AVID and PBIS strategies, utilizing monthly meetings to realign and collaborate on best practices and classroom interventions. Trainings will specifically identify the two pillars of focus this year (organization, engagement).

**Person Responsible** Stefanie Elliott (slelliot@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct an ERPL with district and school-based supports (Ellzey, Ford, Jefferies, Rushing) to support all staff in implementation of research-based best practices and interventions for tier 2 and 3 support.

**Person Responsible** LaSherica Jefferies (ldjeffer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

## 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

Because 67% of our third grade students scored a 1 or 2 on the FSA, we as a school entity know that we need to focus heavily on our early interventions in reading. Deliverable lesson plans with timely and explicit feedback will allow instructional leaders to support teachers in aligning standards and collecting feedback for differentiated by rigorous instruction.

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

Because 67% of our third grade students scored a 1 or 2 on the FSA, we as a school entity know that we need to focus heavily on our ELA proficiency and learning gains in the coming years. Deliverable lesson

plans with timely and explicit feedback will allow instructional leaders to support teachers in aligning standards and collecting feedback for differentiated by rigorous instruction.

### **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)**

Within the 2022-2023 school year, Palm Terrace will have 51% of students in grades K-3 score at or above proficiency as it is defined by the Renaissance testing platform in the third CSPM testing window.

### **Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Within the 2022-2023 school year, Palm Terrace will have 45% of students in grades 3-5 score at or above proficiency as it is defined by CSPM as measured by the FAST assessment in the third progress monitoring testing window.

### **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.

Palm Terrace will monitor the goal via the two prior CSPM testing windows, one at the beginning of the year as a baseline and the other as a diagnostic measurement of progress. District assessments and formative assessments in the classroom will serve as intermittent data points to create micro data on standards-based rubrics and checklists.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Copelin, Anthony, amcopeli@volusia.k12.fl.us



**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?

Decision Tree interventions that were state approved and evidence based will be the only interventions offered on campus (SIPPS, ABC Foundations, Kilpatrick, Stepping Stones, etc). These programs all meet Florida's definition of evidence-based. These programs all align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan based on decision tree information. All programs align to foundational standards and benchmarks as outlined in the ELA B.E.S.T. standards.

**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?

All needs will be addressed using the district-provided decision trees. Criteria from the decision tree in conjunction with Ongoing Progress Monitoring will identify and support all stakeholders in defining criteria for specific program use. The effectiveness is established through district norms and standards to determine effectiveness per targeted population.

**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                |
|---|--|
| Literacy Leadership - a Literacy Leadership Team was established prior to the beginning of the school year to include all administrators, coaches, media specialists, and intervention teachers. Literacy Leadership will meet frequently as needed to establish understanding of current and up to date data and form actionable steps to plan for further progress. | Troutman, Karen,<br>kmtroutm@volusia.k12.fl.us   |
| Literacy Coaching - Palm Terrace's literacy coach will establish coaching cycles with teachers on an as-needed basis. The coach will utilize research- and evidence-based coaching tools to support teachers in increasing student achievement.   | Masters, Kimberly,<br>kmmaster@volusia.k12.fl.us |
| Assessment - all stakeholders will utilize assessment data to further inform practice and drive instruction. School Leadership Team will meet monthly to recognize deficits and plan data-driven courses of action therein. Collaborative Planning will be informed via up-to-date assessment data.   | Miller, Madison,<br>mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us   |
| Professional Learning - standards-aligned learning opportunities build from deficits and areas of focus led by school and district leaders.   | Miller, Madison,<br>mtmiller@volusia.k12.fl.us   |

### 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.

Palm Terrace is a PBIS - Positive Behavior Intervention System - school. A committee is formed on campus representing all grade levels in order to capitalize on teacher and student voice and build capacity and ownership to increase campus-wide efficacy as it relates to school culture and environment, directly impacting student achievement.

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

Carrie Crkvenac - Support leadership with acquisition of and implementation of all PBIS best practices as defined by district standards.

Karen Troutman - Driving force and leadership behind the message of positive school culture and environment.

Stefanie Elliott - provide students with an opportunity to engage with positive adults daily. These positive adults create an environment of high expectations, stability, and love. Main contact for both PBIS and AVID as it relates to all stakeholders.

Madison Miller - Engage with all stakeholders to ensure a positive culture and environment is established

for all in a way that promotes inclusivity and diversity and includes voices that are representative of the population served.

LaSherica Jefferies - MTSS contact, supporting staff with developing and implementing tier 2 and 3 supports from an academic perspective.

Yvonne Rusing - MTSS team member, supporting staff with developing and implementing tier 2 and 3 supports from a psychologist perspective.

Kim Masters/Anthony Copelin - Through coaching, promote kindness and empathy tailored to the needs' of students teachers, and families. While ensuring, modeling to create a safe place for kindness, respect, and understanding to blossom between students, staff, and guardians independently.