

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Focus Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Focus Academy

304 DRUID HILLS RD, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

focusacademytampa.org

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Focus Academy is a Florida Public Charter School and Transition Program offering a modified Exceptional Student Education (ESE) curriculum and unique therapeutic supports for students with cognitive and/or developmental disabilities in grades 6-12 and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Focus Academy envisions a public school in which all students with cognitive and/or developmental disabilities have the same opportunities and support as their peers to embrace a strong education for their future. Focus Academy is a safe place for students to enhance the quality of their lives by experiencing a unique environment with strong social-emotional and therapeutic support. This integration of classroom curriculum and direct support creates a place where Education Meets Life.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kraft, Elisabeth	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the school's day to day functions.
Gallo-Lopez, Loretta	Other	Oversee the program aspects of the school as well as the mental health staff and therapists.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Over the summer the leadership team held meetings with various teachers and school staff members to discuss areas of improvement for the school for the upcoming school year. Potential areas of focus were as follows: Positive culture/environment for staff (in order to increase staff retention), Instructional practices(more targeted coaching and mentoring for teachers), Targeting small group learning opportunities to incorporate more direct instruction of individual student learning goals and objectives and more concise alignment with the new state BEST standards. The leadership team also utilized the annual parent survey to determine areas for improvement for the school from the parental perspective. While parents did not specifically target the same areas listed above, the area of academics received the lowest scoring(although percentages given by parents were still above average). The leadership team did have individual discussions with students across campus to gain their insight. The majority stated

that they wanted opportunities to continue to increase their reading and math levels in order to have better opportunities in their future.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The leadership team will conduct a quarterly review of the targeted areas of focus to determine if any revision is necessary and to track progress on goals of the plan.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: UNSATISFACTORY 2018-19: COMMENDABLE 2017-18: MAINTAINING
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	51	50	38	52	51	23		
ELA Learning Gains				31					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	22	42	38	23	39	38	45		
Math Learning Gains				7					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	22	64	64		46	40			
Social Studies Achievement*	19	69	66		49	48	46		
Middle School Acceleration					41	44			
Graduation Rate	94	89	89	100	64	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	0	62	65	0	72	67	0		
ELP Progress		39	45						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	190
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	94

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	199
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	32	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	19	Yes	1	1
FRL	22	Yes	1	1

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	43			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			22			22	19		94	0	
SWD	33			22			22	19		0	6	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	44			36			30				3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	21			17			20				3	
FRL	26			19			21	20			4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	38	31		23	7					100	0	
SWD	38	31		23	7					100	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	43											

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	23			45				46		100	0	
SWD	23			45				46		100	0	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT				45						100	0	
FRL				50								

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends.

Data included is mainly from the 21-22 school year and not the 22-23 school year. Therefore the following information will be related to the old data. In regards to student testing, the lowest performance was in Mathematics of the students who were tested with a state standardized alternate assessment. Internal assessments, that were given to all students did not reflect the same low performance related to mathematics. Performance on state assessments in the area of mathematics across the state/country were at record lows. Very likely an outcome of the pandemic and the instability of learning during that time.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Based on the data charts under Needs Assessment/Data Review, the area of mathematics had the greatest decline from 2019 to 2022. Again, due to the population that is served at Focus Academy and the tremendous instability that occurred over the span of years from 2019-2022, the pandemic is likely the largest factor that contributed to this decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

State averages were not included in our data charts, most likely due to the specialized population that is served at our school, therefore we cannot answer this question accurately.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Based on the limited data that was included in the schools data charts, the component that showed the most improvement from 2021 to 2022 was ELA Achievement. 2023 data has not yet been added, which makes it difficult to answer this question related to last years data. The data from 2021 showed a decline from 2019, again likely related to the instability in learning due to the pandemic. The improvement in ELA from 2021 to 2022 was most likely related to the fact that all students were back in the classroom learning in person and receiving direct instruction, targeted small group learning opportunities that were hands on and experiential in nature which contributed to the increase in ELA achievement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Student attendance and student performance on state math assessments.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

- 1.) Staff retention
- 2.) Targeted coaching and mentoring for teachers and instructional staff
- 3.) Implementation of specifically targeted small group learning in math and reading

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Over the last 2 years, teacher/staff retention and recruitment has been an area of concern for the school's leadership team. Retention of staff/teachers directly relates to academic success for students. In addition, recruiting staff/teachers who are innovative and experienced in working with the population of students that we serve also directly relates to student academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, Focus Academy will retain 90% of current staff utilizing a variety of staff engagement activities.

Monitoring:

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

On a quarterly basis, school leadership will analyze current staff listing and determine if retention of staff is being accomplished.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elisabeth Kraft (elisabeth.kraft@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Sunshine committee to promote positivity, appreciation and engagement. Activities that recognize staff birthday's, appreciation of their contribution to the school, ongoing check in's with staff - opening the line of communication between the leadership team and school staff to improve employee engagement within the school. Quarterly meals together as a team to create opportunities for staff to interact in an informal way.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Taking purposeful steps to engage staff and recognize their contribution to the school are effective ways to increase positive mindsets and thinking about the workplace environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- 1.) Create and provide funding for the sunshine committee
- 2.) Schedule ongoing meetings for staff check in's
- 3.) Celebrate accomplishments of staff - giving recognition for those accomplishments even in small ways.

Person Responsible: Elisabeth Kraft (elisabeth.kraft@charter.hcps.net)

By When: June 1, 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

An area of need that has been identified is ongoing coaching/mentoring of teachers/instructional staff across the campus. If teachers are not provided with opportunities to grow professionally, then instructional practices will suffer which directly relates to student progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, Focus Academy will support 80% of teachers in meeting individual growth plan goals by providing ongoing coaching in areas that each teacher has identified as a personal growth area.

Monitoring:

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

Focus Academy leadership will monitor this by reviewing teacher growth plans and progress on them, utilizing the personal growth plan template through the Florida Consortium of Public Charter Schools evaluation tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elisabeth Kraft (elisabeth.kraft@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ongoing Coaching/Mentoring
Professional Growth Plans

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers having access to ongoing coaching to improve instructional practices has proven to increase teacher effectiveness and increase student progress.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

- 1.) Hire part-time coaches
- 2.) Identify plan for support
- 3.) Monitor progress of coaches thru weekly/monthly meetings
- 4.) Implement targeted PD opportunities based on the needs of teachers as identified on each teachers professional growth plan

Person Responsible: Elisabeth Kraft (elisabeth.kraft@charter.hcps.net)

By When: June 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Positive Culture and Environment - Staff retention

The school has budgeted \$4,000 for the designated Sunshine Committee to have the resources necessary to provide ongoing opportunities for staff engagement and recognition. Additional money will be utilized to provide quarterly celebrations for the staff.

Instructional Practices through Coaching and PD

The school has budgeted \$20,000 from the general fund to cover the additional expenses to add instructional coaches to the school staff.