

Pinellas County Schools

Oakhurst Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oakhurst Elementary School

10535 137TH ST, Largo, FL 33774

<http://www.oakhurst-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Kennedy C

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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)	31%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (67%) 2020-21: (60%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

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 Oakhurst Elementary School is to educate and inspire each student to reach maximum potential, become lifelong learners and responsible citizens through the Mustang Way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Oakhurst Elementary is 100% student success.

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
Kennedy, Kelly	Principal	Oversees the school, Oversees the ILT, facilitates PD, MTSS process, Oversees all budgets, SAC, PTA, Family Engagement, CST, Teacher evaluations and walk throughs, facilitates the School Leadership Team and the Instructional leadership team, Equity Champion
Smith, Chelsea	Assistant Principal	Learning Specialist, instructional walk throughs, teacher evaluation, Testing Coordinator, MTSS team member, ILT, Equity Champion
Sanders, Tracey	Behavior Specialist	Behavior Specialist; PBIS Coordinator, Equity Champion
Pratt, Alexis	Guidance Counselor	MTSS Team Member, Mustang Round-Up, Classroom Guidance, CST Member, 504 Coordinator, Equity Champion
Cuzzucoli, Gregg	Teacher, K-12	PE Teacher, Healthy Schools Coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Kelly Kennedy C

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

642

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

8

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	116	90	99	102	89	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	0	32	22	18	26	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	1	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/20/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0
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 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	69%			69%			69%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%			65%			68%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%			52%			40%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	78%			73%			79%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%			65%			68%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%			26%			48%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	71%			69%			68%	53%	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	72%	56%	16%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	54%	14%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

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	78%	62%	16%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	64%	17%	64%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	60%	19%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	53%	14%
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
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	28	43		33	38		20				
BLK	64			64							
HSP	59	55		56	45		64				
MUL	61			76							
WHT	71	69	57	75	68	36	71				
FRL	55	67	46	60	50	21	54				
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	29	33	19	46	50	41	27				
BLK	64	80		64	60						
HSP	58	66	33	67	51	50	44				
MUL	77			100							
WHT	71	69	42	81	71	47	72				
FRL	57	62	33	69	57	44	55				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
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	69
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	69
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	53
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?

One trend that emerged requiring further support is the subgroup, students with disabilities (SWD). In English/Language Arts (ELA) only 31% of SWD were proficient, compared to the overall school proficiency of 69%. Another data point requiring focus is the 3rd grade ELA proficiency rate of 59%, falling 10 percentage points below the school's achievement level.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA results, the greatest need for improvement is in English/Language Arts (ELA) proficiency. Specifically the proficiency of students with disabilities and the L25 quartile. Students with disabilities had 31% proficiency which is 38 percentage points below the school's ELA achievement level. Another point of focus is the third grade cohort at 59% proficiency in ELA which is 10 percentage points below the overall school's ELA achievement level.

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 lack of consistency with specific interventions to target and support students with their specific needs. More focused student-centered instruction and standards-based instruction with rigor. We need to increase time on task reading grade-level text, engaging in discussion, and writing with feedback. We need more emphasis on foundational skills, with high quality feedback and opportunities to use that feedback. We also need to consistently analyze data in PLCs to inform instruction in whole group, small group, and one-to-one instruction.

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

Based on the 2021 and 2022 statewide assessments, the greatest improvement was made in the L25 Mathematics learning gains. Based on the statewide assessments, in 2021, learning gains were at 26% and in 2022 the learning gains soared to 54%. This 28 percentage point increase is a major improvement, as were the overall gains made in math based on the statewide assessments of 2021 and 2022, the gains increased from 65% to 74%, respectively.

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

Our school focused on aligning the interventions with the students' needs, based on data. Instructional supports were provided to grade level teams to maximize learning outcomes. In the intermediate grade

levels, the program IXL in conjunction to instructional supports, students were able to focus on their individualized learning needs.

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

1. Increase ELA L25 Learning Gains and ELA performance for all students by increasing school wide focus on aligning the level of rigor to standard-based instruction.
2. Increase Math L25 Learning Gains and Math performance by all students by increasing school wide focus on aligning the level of rigor to standards-based instruction.
3. Increase school-wide focus on high-level strategies that transitions the classroom environment from teacher-centered to student-centered with rigor.
4. Increase implementation of culturally responsive instructional strategies with a focus on PBIS that creates a positive learning environment and culture.

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.

1. Equity-Based professional development
2. District instructional content specialists to provide quarterly professional development
3. Professional development provided by the Assessment, Accountability and Research department

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

1. Continuous monitoring of student progress, specifically the interventions that are being provided.
2. Targeting students for specific programs, such as the Extended Learning Program (ELP).
3. Ongoing walkthroughs and timely feedback provided to teachers regarding instructional practices.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year displays an increase in students performing below grade in ELA, Math, Science, and Bridging the Gap. The area of focus will remain on consistently aligning tasks to grade-appropriate standards and providing students with consistent opportunities to be successful.

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts (ELA) will increase 11% (from 69% to 80%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).
 Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 2% (from 78% to 80%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).
 Proficiency in Science will increase 9% (from 71% to 80%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).
 Proficiency in ELA Black students will increase from 13% (from 67% to 80%), as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Monitoring:

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

Walk through data, data chats, PLCs, observation feedback and professional development will be utilized to monitor the success of the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Kennedy (kennedyke@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Empower teachers as instructional leaders within their classrooms by sharing best practices through co-teaching, opening classrooms for observation, debrief and feedback. Ensure that rigorous, student-centered instruction occurs daily with standards-aligned tasks. This work will be supported through curriculum meetings, PLCs, feedback, and/or the use of classroom videos.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Gain a deeper understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards to improve student outcomes while utilizing curricular materials to create a common foundation of standards-aligned, rigorous expectations for all 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.

1. Grade level instructional staff will share common collaborative planning time focused on student data for the understanding and planning of the B.E.S.T. standards and tasks to increase rigorous student-centered learning within the Core. The focus will be on releasing students to engage in independent, standards-aligned tasks.
2. Evidence of on-going professional development will be present within instructional practices.
3. Student assessment data will drive instructional decisions and students will be identified to participate in specific small group instruction during the school day and/or extended learning opportunities.
4. All instructional staff will participate in a review on understanding progress monitoring data and goal setting.

5. All students will work with their homeroom teacher to set academic progress monitoring goals. Following each assessment cycle, students who meet or exceed their goal will be acknowledged celebrated.

Person Responsible Kelly Kennedy (kennedyke@pcsb.org)

#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.

Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year displays Students with Disabilities performing below proficiency. The area of focus will remain on consistently aligning tasks to grade-appropriate standards and providing students with consistent opportunities to be successful.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Proficiency for Students with Disabilities in ELA will increase 45 percentage points, from 35% to 80%, as measured by the end of the school year progress monitoring tool.

Monitoring:

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

Walk through data, data chats, PLCs, observation feedback and professional development will be utilized to monitor the success of the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chelsea Smith (smithchels@pcsb.org)

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

Prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback and engaging students in rigorous tasks and assignments across all grade levels, and aligning those tasks to B.E.S.T. Standards, will allow students to show growth in all areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Engaging students with disabilities in grade-level appropriate rigorous tasks that are aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards, will allow students to show growth and reach proficiency. Collaborative planning will support instructional decisions for differentiation strategies to help close gaps in standards acquisition.

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. Continue to strategically cluster students with disabilities into classrooms based on academic level and IEP Goals, including inclusive scheduling to the maximum extent possible when in the best interest of students.
2. Continue with collaboration with cross-articulation between Gen. Ed. teacher and ESE teachers to support rigorous grade-level standards-based instruction in order to close gap.
3. Partner our students with disabilities who are not making learning gains with a mentor.
4. Plan for higher-order thinking questions in advance, using the DOK to build them from low level to higher level questioning.
5. Implement a structured walk to intervention within entire grade levels.
6. Implement supplemental reading intervention program to address phonics gaps for Tier 3 students.
7. Schedule testing for ESE students in order to minimize and eliminate instructional time loss.

Person Responsible

Chelsea Smith (smithchels@pcsb.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.

Our Equity Champions and PBIS Coordinators will lead our Equity training incorporating class meetings, Restorative Practices, PBIS, Culturally Relevant Teaching with a focus on Social Emotional Learning. Understanding and honoring culturally defined beliefs, needs, styles and behaviors of the students, families, and communities we serve. Valuing the benefit that individual differences bring to our school district. Recognizing the importance of individual similarities and differences while working effectively with all stakeholders from various cultures, races, ethnicity and religious backgrounds. Teachers create/develop conditions for learning that empower learners to plan, monitor, reflect, and think deeper about one's learning. Teachers intentionally create a learning environment that is relevant to and reflective of their students' social, cultural, and linguistic experiences with students' cultures and experiences as assets for learning. Partner our black students not making learning gains with a mentor who will touch-base at least once a week. Partner our primary black students not making learning gains with NEHS and/or PMAC students who will meet with them and serve as a mentor.

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

Kelly Kennedy, Principal - Facilitate monthly Mustang Roundups to promote positive school culture and recognize individual students for character, provide time during faculty meetings to share PBIS and Equity strategies, determine specific needs of students at MTSS and SBLT meetings, collaborate with PTA and SAC to promote positive school culture and environment

Chelsea Smith, Assistant Principal - Facilitate the implementation of PBIS and Equity strategies, determine specific needs of students at MTSS and SBLT meetings

Tracey Sanders, Behavior Specialist - Support in the facilitation of the PBIS and Equity strategies, monitor behavior interventions being implemented, monitor schoolwide behavior data to determine specific needs of students at MTSS and SBLT meetings

Alexis Pratt, Guidance Counselor - Support in the facilitation of the monthly Mustang Roundups to promote positive school culture and recognize students for character, provide instructional guidance lessons to classes and small groups