

Alachua County Public Schools

William S. Talbot Elem 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

William S. Talbot Elem School

5701 NW 43RD ST, Gainesville, FL 32653

<https://www.sbac.edu/talbot>

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Beland

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2021

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)	40%
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 (63%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

William S. Talbot Elem School

5701 NW 43RD ST, Gainesville, FL 32653

<https://www.sbac.edu/talbot>

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	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Alachua County School Board on 12/6/2022.

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.

To teach children in a way that promotes academic growth and life-long learning within a safe environment, which recognizes the diversity of children's' needs and abilities.

We are committed to the success of every student!

Provide the school's vision statement.

W. S. Talbot Elementary School strives for excellence by actively involving all students, parents, staff and the community in a safe, nurturing and respectful environment.

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
Beland, Chris	Principal	
Freedman, Sarah	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/6/2021, Christopher Beland

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

634

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

6

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

4

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	91	114	111	72	101	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	0	36	33	12	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
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	1	0	0	6	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	112	88	97	120	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	9	14	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	12	4	8	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	1	6	5	8	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	8	4	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	112	88	97	120	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	633
Attendance below 90 percent	0	16	9	14	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	12	4	8	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	1	6	5	8	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	8	4	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	70%	53%	56%				68%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	61%				60%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	43%	52%				32%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	68%	55%	60%				66%	60%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%	58%	64%				66%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	46%	55%				42%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	48%	51%				62%	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	67%	57%	10%	58%	9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	66%	55%	11%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

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	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	69%	57%	12%	60%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	61%	55%	6%	53%	8%
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	30	43	33	28	46	35	20				
ELL	69			81							
ASN	87	62		91	100						
BLK	27	41	33	24	56	42	12				
HSP	67	82		62	91						
MUL	68	69		68	81						
WHT	80	72	67	77	77	50	67				
FRL	47	53	44	39	61	49	28				

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	21			18							
ELL	58			58							
ASN	68			68							
BLK	27	29		29	31		12				
HSP	65			50			50				
MUL	55			35							
WHT	80	74		71	62		63				
FRL	37	38	20	27	38	27	31				
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	39	26	20	50	43	21				
ELL	73			91							
ASN	74	74		81	79		75				
BLK	31	39	36	36	49	43	14				
HSP	60	44		63	63						
MUL	66	50		57	67		47				
WHT	82	69	9	77	71	39	79				
FRL	42	48	43	44	55	42	38				

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	63
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	443
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
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	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	85
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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
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	72
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	70
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	46
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?

A decline in learning gains is a common trend amongst grade levels and content areas, especially in the lowest 25th percentile, African American students, and students with disabilities.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is increasing learning gains in core content areas, with a focus in our lowest quartile students. ELA lowest 25th percentile included 49% of students making learning gains and Math lowest 25th percentile included 54% of students making 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?

Contributing factors include learning gaps and lack of assessment stamina due to the ongoing pandemic (numerous and frequent amounts of student/teacher/staff absences due to quarantining), as well as teachers having to learn new curriculum and state standards. Actions to address this need will involve frequent progress monitoring and data driven intervention lessons for all students.

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

Achievement in English Language Arts, Math, and Science and overall learning gains in ELA and math improved significantly in previous years.

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

Previously, contributing factors to success were strategic pacing of curriculum, effective use of curriculum, and data driven progress monitoring plans for all students.

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

To accelerate learning we will implement intentional scaffolding for all students, build knowledge and vocabulary using multimedia resources, and identify essential missed learning.

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 and leaders will have professional development opportunities regarding new and existing instructional resources, including the University of Florida's Literacy Initiative (UFLI), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), and Benchmark Advanced.

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

Additional services to ensure sustainability will include individualized professional development and frequent progress monitoring by grade-level and admin teams.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Improve the academic learning and proficiency of African American students in core academic areas, specifically in English Language Arts and mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the achievement of African American students in English Language Arts from 29% (2022) to 41% (2023) and in mathematics from 27% (2022) to 41% (2023).

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring by school leaders ensure that students' needs are being met (FAST, DIBELS, ISIP, classroom assessments).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Beland (belandcr@gm.sbac.edu)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Instructional planning and lessons specifically aligned with standards-based practices

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Standards-based instruction allows for grade-level curriculum and instruction to be developed and used for all students, specifically students performing below grade level, implement CORE and MTSS together (tier 1 instruction should target 100% of students) and use SMART goals for specific-learning expectations.

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.

Collaborative planning for teams each nine weeks, common planning time daily, professional development with ELA and mathematics BEST standards, meet quarterly with Literacy Leadership Committee and School Math Group

Person Responsible

Chris Beland (belandcr@gm.sbac.edu)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

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

Improve the academic learning and proficiency of students with disabilities in core academic areas, specifically in English Language Arts and mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase the achievement of students with disabilities in English Language Arts from 30% (2022) to 41% (2023) and in mathematics from 28% (2022) to 41% (2023).

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring by school leaders ensure that students' needs are being met (FAST, DIBELS, ISIP, classroom assessments).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Use the ICEL strategy and focus on Instruction and Curriculum in support facilitation classrooms that include students with disabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Promoting appropriate Instructional practices (scaffolding, remediation) and Curriculum (core curriculum, length, format, difficulty) offers students with disabilities daily rigorous learning opportunities.

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.

Incorporate feedback from BPIE committee (Goal: Improve MTSS process and collaborative planning for ESE teachers), combine CORE and ICEL practices with a focus on Instruction and Curriculum, data-based decision making, professional development related to support facilitation

Person Responsible

Sarah Freedman (freedmsm@gm.sbac.edu)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to School and Classroom Climate

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

Enhance the school day and activities for students and staff, making the environment positive and proactive for all stakeholders.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Decrease the amount of in-school suspensions for African American students by 10% from 2022 to 2023.

Monitoring:

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

Behavior Contact Log (BRT), Skyward discipline referrals, discipline outcomes

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Utilize PBIS as an evidence-based practice to improve and integrate all data, systems, and practices affecting daily student outcomes.

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 district-approved program that supports all students through clear and transparent expectations. Resources: Align the CORE with PBIS frameworks.

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.

Define PAWS expectations and highlight for each school area (classroom, hallways, cafeteria, playground), Identify areas to use Tiger Tickets and Terrific Tiger awards (award and incentive systems), meet quarterly with school PBIS committee and include district staff with professional development

Person Responsible

Chris Beland (belandcr@gm.sbac.edu)

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 teachers and staff at Talbot Elementary School understand the importance of having a positive school culture and environment and take pride in bringing joy to the school campus every day. There is a shared belief that every student matters, and each staff member uses their role to create

and foster relationships and promote positivity at Talbot that allow all students to reach academic success. High expectations, positive reinforcements, and collaboration are all used to meet our goals.

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

Talbot faculty and staff work with parents and other members of the community, including businesses, clubs, higher education institutions, and various groups. The Talbot PTA is heavily involved in promoting a positive school culture.