

School District of Indian River County

Sebastian River High 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	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sebastian River High School

9001 90TH AVE, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Cummings

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	54%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sebastian River High School

9001 90TH AVE, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">54%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

The mission of Sebastian River High School is “Encouraging Innovation and Promoting Excellence” with all students, so that each student achieves to their highest potential and becomes a contributing member of the global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Sebastian River High School is to ensure every student is college and career ready by creating a culture of excellence that is constantly focused on student achievement. We will create a climate of high expectation to ensure equitable access is achieved by ALL students in all areas. We will identify new areas of innovations and encourage a collaborative culture that is built by students, parents, staff, and community members collectively. We will meet the social and emotional needs of our students and their families, in order to provide a safe and healthy learning community.

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
Cummings, Christopher	Principal	
Contri, Jacque	Assistant Principal	
Thimmer, James	Assistant Principal	
Van Brimmer, Kevin	Assistant Principal	
Pinkney, Elizebeth	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Christopher Cummings

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.*

28

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

123

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,842

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

10

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	478	483	460	412	1833
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	157	169	147	161	634
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	28	18	13	101
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	75	110	95	401
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	71	97	61	299
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	111	99	89	430
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	110	135	116	463
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	173	158	166	133	630

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	17	10	54

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/21/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491	460	410	434	1795
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	107	97	114	418
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	32	9	12	98
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113	117	55	74	359
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	67	48	86	283
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	108	79	88	397
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	152	123	111	502
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	108	79	88	397

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	111	121	88	100	420

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	54	19	0	119
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	22	9	0	52

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	46%	51%	51%				46%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						49%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						33%	40%	42%
Math Achievement	23%	41%	38%				36%	48%	51%
Math Learning Gains	31%						40%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						29%	39%	45%
Science Achievement	55%	28%	40%				59%	68%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	33%	48%				47%	68%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	58%	64%	-6%	67%	-9%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	45%	64%	-19%	70%	-25%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	29%	58%	-29%	61%	-32%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	41%	53%	-12%	57%	-16%

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	18	24	18	13	27	38	35	40		94	35
ELL	6	31	31	5	23	44	27			100	33
BLK	34	45	36	14	32	42	35	48		100	62
HSP	35	41	37	16	25	42	47	45		97	63
MUL	54	46		12	13		44			91	60
WHT	55	53	38	31	37	50	66	69		96	71
FRL	35	40	37	18	29	42	44	48		96	62
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	19	34	26	16	23	28	43	51		89	31
ELL	7	28	29	9	31	47	37			85	33
ASN	60	60									
BLK	36	38	31	19	20	22	61	51		88	56
HSP	32	37	29	22	25	31	51	50		88	62
MUL	48	54	50	24	23		69			100	20
WHT	57	49	42	37	24	18	65	75		94	67
FRL	35	35	31	24	22	23	54	55		90	60

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	18	34	27	14	31	30	30	38		88	16
ELL	14	23	19	13	29	23	22	6		82	
ASN	69	50									
BLK	43	46	26	26	39	46	53	33		80	36
HSP	38	44	27	30	39	24	55	42		87	63
MUL	36	52		29	38		40				
WHT	52	53	46	43	41	27	64	54		96	64
FRL	36	42	26	31	38	30	51	45		89	56

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	45
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	46
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	46
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	57
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	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Based on FSA data, ELA scores remained at 46% over the last three testing period, and 20% of prior year proficiency failed to remain proficient, indicating a need for additional support for students on the threshold to remain proficient.

Based on EOC data, Math scores decreased to 23% from last year's 29% and 18-19 39%, and 49% of prior year proficiency failed to remain proficient, indicating a need for additional support for students on the threshold to remain proficient.

ESSA Subgroups: ELL 38% & SWD 34%

The above two subgroups will need additional action steps written in the academic section of the SIP to increase overall proficiency for the upcoming school year.

Based on FDOE data:

21-22 ELA ACH score of 46% remained the same as the 18-19 target of 46%.

21-22 Math ACH score of 26% fell below the 18-19 target of 36%.

21-22 Science ACH score of 55% fell below the 18-19 target of 59%.

21-22 Social Studies score of 58% increase from the 18-19 target of 47%.

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

22-23 ELA ACH- score of 46% has remained the same since 2016, and the Spring 2022 FSA data indicated that 20% of those students were proficient in 2021 dropped in 2022).

22-23 Math ACH score of 26% is the 3rd year of a slow steady decline in Math achievement.

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 pandemic was a contributing factor, as well as the fear associated with sending the students back to school. The Covid outbreaks were a great cause for concern regarding short-term, long-term, and intermittently interrupted education.

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

Attendance and with this, the percentage of students participating in the state and local progress monitoring is 95%

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

Attendance and tardy plans have been implemented. Raising awareness about the importance of 95%, or better attendance with parents and guardians, has been a significant factor in families making sure their students come to school. If one wants success for their children, the children should have regular attendance and be present in the classroom.

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

Monitoring and Feedback (Formative Assessments)

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.

All teachers will be provided with professional development addressing the Collaborative Planning process with a targeted focus on daily Monitoring of student progress throughout lessons and PD addressing new data tools.

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

Administration and Coaches will sit with teachers during Collaborative planning to provide support in Monitoring of student progress throughout lessons. Additionally, Administration will conduct daily classroom walk-through observations in all state-tested classroom areas, which they evaluate to determine the implementation of monitoring strategies. Lastly, Administration will share non-evaluative observation data with instructional Coaches during Bi-Weekly Instructional Coaches' meetings to determine the instructional support needed.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

Based on FSA data, ELA scores remained at 46% over the last three testing period, and 20% of prior year proficiency failed to remain proficient, indicating a need for additional support for students on the threshold to remain proficient.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

By the end of the 1st Nine Weeks of instruction 50% of all classes will utilize Monitoring and Feedback strategies through the use of Formative Assessments to inform the teacher of what instructional changes need to occur to support continued student achievement for 100% of students. Teachers' lesson plans, from collaborative planning sessions, will reflect how they will intentionally administer formative assessments with students each day during instructional time and provide feedback.

Monitoring:

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

The principal will schedule weekly administrative meetings and bi-weekly coach meetings to determine the schedule and ensure someone is present at all collaborative planning sessions. If a PD is delivered, School Administration will monitor PD sessions and sign-in sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizbeth Pinkney (elizabeth.pinkney@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Monitoring & Feedback: Formative Assessments

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Formative Assessments have 2 components. First, an common formative assessment can tell the student where they are in their understanding. It is designed with questions that are asked during a lesson that gives students an opportunity to gauge their own understanding. Second, the formative assessment gives valuable feedback during a lesson. Changes can be made to adapt instruction to meet the needs of the students.

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.

All teachers will be provided with professional development addressing the Collaborative Planning process with a targeted focus on daily Monitoring of student progress throughout lessons.

Person Responsible Elizebeth Pinkney (elizabeth.pinkney@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and Coaches will sit with ELA teachers during Collaborative planning to provide support in Monitoring student progress throughout lessons.

Person Responsible Elizebeth Pinkney (elizabeth.pinkney@indianriverschools.org)

The administration will conduct daily classroom walk-through observations in all state-tested classroom areas they evaluate, to determine the implementation of monitoring strategies.

Person Responsible Kevin Van Brimmer (kevin.vanbrimmer@indianriverschools.org)

The administration will share non-evaluative observation data with instructional Coaches during Bi-Weekly Instructional Coaches' meetings to determine the instructional support needed.

Person Responsible Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and Coaches will share non-evaluative observation data with School Leadership Team during Monthly Leadership Data meetings and discuss barriers and challenges teachers are faced during collaborative planning, lesson implementation, curriculum pacing, etc, which may affect the implementation of the monitoring and feedback strategy.

Person Responsible Christopher Cummings (christopher.cummings@indianriverschools.org)

Instructional Coaches will provide teachers within ELA Department meetings with follow-up professional development with monitoring and formative assessments that target ESSA sub-groups.

Person Responsible Elizebeth Pinkney (elizabeth.pinkney@indianriverschools.org)

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.

Data Findings:

- Our 21-22 Climate survey results show that the highest frequency areas of need are procedures, students out of class, and discipline.

Rationale for Selection of Data:

- Discipline data and climate survey information have shown that due to 3 areas of need, we can increase

our students instructional time in class.

High Yield Strategy: Environment

Goal: By the end of October, we will create policies and systems to target our campus' three highest areas of need (consistent procedures, student instructional time, and student discipline). This is intended to improve student and staff culture as evident by a staff survey that will show 66% or more of staff will feel that the new procedures are consistent, student instructional time has increased (due to procedures), and student discipline is consistent throughout the school.

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

(Leadership, Faculty, and Staff)

- Implement consistent cell phone policy
- Implement Attendance and Tardy Policy
- Out of Class - "Pass" Policy
- Staff Survey
- Teacher Recognition