

Marion County Public Schools

# Bellevue Santos Elementary School



2020-21 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>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>17</b>

# Belleview Santos Elementary School

9600 SE US HIGHWAY 441, Belleview, FL 34420

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Kim White

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (35%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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 Marion 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Belleview-Santos will develop academically minded learners through the planning and implementation of rigorous and relevant instruction and collaborative teaching in a safe environment.

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

Belleview-Santos works with all stakeholders to create educational opportunities where all students can learn.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
White, Kimberly	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Polish, Alison	Guidance Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Lafferty, Shanon	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Haworth, Angelique	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.
Viles, Teresa	Instructional Coach	Math- The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.
Suranni, Joseph	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**  
 Saturday 6/29/2019, Kim White

**Number of teachers with a 2019 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 2019 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.*

6

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

36

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: D (35%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A

<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

The number of students by 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	85	71	79	102	77	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	46	34	28	49	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	5	6	1	13	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	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	3	5	2	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/15/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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	84	80	72	112	83	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	12	16	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	3	5	4	14	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	16	30	16	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	15	24	28	8	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

**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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Prior Year - Updated**

**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	84	80	72	112	83	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	12	11	12	16	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	3	5	4	14	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA or Math	14	16	30	16	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	15	24	28	8	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117

**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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	47%	57%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	56%	58%	51%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	53%	48%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	51%	63%	49%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	58%	62%	39%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	49%	51%	36%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	47%	53%	35%	51%	51%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

### Grade Level Data

**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
03	2019	37%	44%	-7%	58%	-21%
	2018	44%	46%	-2%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	49%	11%	58%	2%
	2018	42%	43%	-1%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	45%	45%	0%	56%	-11%
	2018	39%	46%	-7%	55%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				
05	2019	32%	45%	-13%	60%	-28%
	2018	19%	50%	-31%	61%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	44%	5%	53%	-4%
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

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	19	58	64	22	48	44	25				
ELL	35	70		42	67						
BLK	31	60	60	18	42	55	31				
HSP	48	68		55	72	42	30				
WHT	57	64	44	54	58	27	67				
FRL	39	65	53	36	53	43	44				

  

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	19	19	5	12	7		8				
ELL	19	12	10	19	12						
BLK	29	22		21	15						
HSP	39	28	13	30	19		29				
WHT	53	42	21	39	26	20	45				
FRL	40	31	17	27	20	6	39				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	17	31	37	17	15	20					
ELL	22	60	70	33	35						
BLK	32	48		35	22		13				
HSP	36	59	57	47	43	33	42				
MUL	40			40							
WHT	52	48	50	54	43	36	39				
FRL	39	48	45	43	39	39	30				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

The lowest performing area were students in the Lowest Quartile in Math. Due to high needs of all students for the 18-19 school year, more focus was given to reading instruction and interventions, thus the lower numbers for math in all areas.

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

All areas showed an increase from 17-18 to 18-19. The area that showed the least amount of gain are ELA proficiencies. ELA proficiencies only showed a 5% gain. Math proficiencies showed a 15% gain moving up from 47% of all 3rd-5th graders being proficient and is the lowest measured area.

**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.**

The largest gap between BSE and the state is in overall math proficiencies. Again, a focus on reading instruction and reading interventions contributed to the lower increases in math achievement levels.

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

Proficiencies in the Lowest Quartile for ELA showed the most improvement. Focused instruction time held 2 times everyday contributed to this increase.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Our area of concern is our Students with Disabilities.

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

1. Raising overall proficiencies in ELA and Math.
2. Raising proficiency levels in math for students in the Lowest Quartile.
3. Increasing ELA and Math proficiencies for SWD.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** A need to improve instructional practice specifically relating to ELA was identified during the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 debriefing of FSA, iReady diagnostics, and QSMA’s data. While ELA proficiency levels are on the rise, there continues to be a gap between our students' achievement levels and that of other students in the State of Florida as measured by the FSA.

**Measurable Outcome:** If teachers implement effective standards-based instruction in ELA then student learning gains and proficiency levels in 4th and 5th grades and students with disabilities will increase by at least 5%.  
 4th grade proficiency from 37% to 42%  
 5th grade proficiency from 60% to 65%  
 Students with Disabilities from 40% to 45%

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The evidence based strategy being implemented to achieve the measurable outcome of improving instructional practice specifically related to ELA is collaborative planning using Florida Standards to support standards-based instruction. Administration will participate/facilitate these sessions to ensure fidelity of the implementation. In addition, administration will utilize classroom observation to provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** High-quality planning and collaboration is strongly associated with increases in students’ achievement on local and state assessments. Therefore, educators need planning time to implement their curriculum, review assessment data, make data-based decisions, and meet the diverse needs of their student population. This strategy was implemented 2 years ago and produced adequate learning gains in ELA. Teachers continue to receive support from Instructional Coaches and Administration in developing standards-based instruction through the use of academic resources. Nevin, A.. (2006). The Many Faces of Collaborative Planning and Teaching. Theory Into Practice. 45. 239.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Schedule common collaborative planning time weekly to develop standards-based lessons and formative assessments to monitor student learning.
2. Provide professional development on how to develop standards-based lessons.
3. Administration will participate/facilitate these sessions to ensure fidelity of the implementation.
4. Administration will utilize classroom observation to provide timely feedback and follow through to determine next steps.

**Person Responsible** Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### Area of Focus

### Description and Rationale:

Learners in the Lowest Quartile for math in 4th and 5th grades showed the least amount of gains from 17-18 to 18-19 as shown by FSA data.

### Measureable Outcome:

If teachers implement effective standards-based instruction and immediate intervention in Math to students in the lowest quartile and students with disabilities then student learning gains and proficiency levels for these subgroup will increase by at least 5%.  
 Learning Gains in the Lowest Quartile from 38% to 43%  
 Students with Disabilities from 40% to 45%

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

### Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative Planning using Florida Standards to support standards-based instruction and professional development on how to intervene immediately to students who struggle with mathematical concepts.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative planning showed to be effective 2 years ago to ensure that teachers are teaching to the depth of the standard. Additionally, research indicates that immediately intervening when a learner misunderstands a concept improves the likelihood that the learner will retain the correct concepts and thus improve achievement levels.

## Action Steps to Implement

1. Schedule weekly collaboration time for math teachers in 4th and 5th grades to plan instruction aligned to the Florida Standards.
2. Monitor learners in the Lowest Quartile in math using QSMA data and iReady data.
3. Provide professional development on how to immediately assess and remediate learners who struggle with math concepts.

### Person Responsible

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Based on the data provided, another priority area for the leadership team will be with attendance. We anticipate an even greater number of absences this year due to the COVID pandemic and the restrictions placed on attendance by the Department of Health and the challenges facing families with online instruction. Our guidance team will be contacting families weekly to help problem solve attendance concerns and our teachers will provide online materials and instruction for those students placed into quarantine to help maintain academic progress during their isolation.**

## Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Positive school culture and environment is supported through school-wide expectations with a positive behavior support system in place. These expectations and supports are communicated to families in monthly newsletters and Skylert messages. Additionally, teachers build a positive school culture via the Sanford Harmony curriculum to support student Social and Emotional Learning. Students learn how to problem solve and work together as a team.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>