Starke Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
mission
college and career
students
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
areas of focus
resources
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Fe

Table of Contents

Starke Elementary School

1000 W WELDON ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/starke

Demographics

Principal: Raymond Schaefer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2020-21: (59%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Bradford 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.

Starke Elementary is committed to providing a safe and healthy environment so each student can grow academically and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Equipping students to excel in the 21st century.

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
Schaefer, Raymond	Principal	School site leader who is responsible for instruction, management, and goal setting.
Rodriguez, Shannon	Assistant Principal	School site leader who supports the instruction, management, and goal setting for the campus.
Eison, Heather	Instructional Coach	Responsible for curriculum supports, coaching, and modeling for K-5 math instruction.
Hines, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Responsible for curriculum supports, coaching, and modeling for grades K-5.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2022, Raymond Schaefer

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

568

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

2

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	80	93	73	88	82	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	26	24	17	24	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	6	8	5	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in Math	3	5	3	12	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	24	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	36	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	40	46	37	33	48	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	237

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	26	24	17	30	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140

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	8	14	4	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/7/2022

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	84	94	73	88	82	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	507
Attendance below 90 percent	14	9	8	11	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	28	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	33	29	30	28	32	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	9	4	8	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	84	94	73	88	82	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	507
Attendance below 90 percent	14	9	8	11	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	28	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	33	29	30	28	32	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	9	4	8	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	51%	44%	56%	55%			58%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	48%	61%	52%			53%	49%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	47%	52%	69%			50%	46%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	46%	60%	59%			59%	55%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%	58%	64%	70%			53%	50%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	49%	55%	57%			40%	35%	51%
Science Achievement	58%	39%	51%	48%			41%	43%	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	61%	59%	2%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	47%	2%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	52%	42%	10%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

				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	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	39%	-1%	53%	-15%
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	26	44	45	31	57	57	22				
BLK	36	57	60	30	62	81	41				
HSP	44	64		39	64						
MUL	53	50		60	50						
WHT	56	55	67	62	66	53	65				
FRL	46	57	62	51	65	72	59				

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	30	50		33	42		43				
BLK	36	43		50	64		33				
HSP	64			45							
MUL	50			30							
WHT	62	50		67	76		60				
FRL	52	53		55	70		45				

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	40	38	24	42	58	43	27				
BLK	39	42	40	37	35	46	18				
HSP				50							
WHT	64	56	52	67	57	35	46				
FRL	53	55	54	54	53	50	34				

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	58
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	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

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	
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	52
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	53
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	53
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	61
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	59
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?

Across grade levels, the star reading progress monitoring data analysis demonstrates that our school wide at/above benchmark proficiency was 50% for diagnostic number 1. By star reading diagnostic number 3 our average amount of students at/above benchmark proficiency was increased by 15% to 65%.

Across grade levels, the Iready math progress monitoring data analysis demonstrates that our school wide on grade level average was 14%. By Iready math diagnostic number 3 our average amount of students on grade level increased 47% to 61%.

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

Via the 2022 FSA data results, our greatest need for improvement was in the focused area of Math Gains. The school demonstrated a 7% decrease in math gains from the previous school year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The contributing factors to this improvement need was instructional focus and shift in grade 4 during semester 2, due to teacher need. The actions we are taking to address this area of improvement are targeted small group instruction, grade level specific math planning and pacing, and data analysis with math coach.

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

Our greatest areas of most improvement occurred in Math L25 gains and science achievement. We increased 10% points from previous year in both categories.

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

Small group instruction and targeted Title 1 teacher instruction with our math students in tested grades 3,4,5. And science increases were do to support of tested benchmarks in STEAM and using School City progress monitoring data to design instruction and target specific small groups of students who needed benchmark supports.

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

Usage of Title 1 and ESE Inclusion teacher small groups supports led to increases of Math L25 gains. Cross curricular supports for science assessment growth was due to grade 5 level planning and using STEAM to encourage and promote higher order thinking questioning and processes.

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.

PD focused around small group instruction, common assessment planning, and Continuous Improvement Strategy training for lesson delivery and structured direct instruction.

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

We are using IXL and Rocket Math to support extended online Math programming to further target areas of need and practice via Title 1 funds.

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 Economically Disadvantaged

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

Focus Math L25 Gains due to 10% decrease from previous assessed year.

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

Measurable outcome to demonstrate 10% increase in Math L25 gains.

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

Small group and targeted remedial instruction with identified Math L25 gains students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Hines
(hines.melissa@mybradford.us)

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

Small group instruction using targeted data analysis to determine benchmark remediation needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Small instructional focus that leads to grade level common planning and instructional sequencing.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Implementation of the UFLI program for all K-2 students with a in-class daily occurrence. Program is designed to meet the needs of tier 1 and tier 2 students. K-2 tier 3 students receive direct and small group instruction from full time title 1 teacher using SRA Early Tutor materials.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We use SIPPS reading instruction with with all tier 3 students via our Title 1 full time teachers. Small group instruction designed to remediate and build upon areas of regression.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Quarterly assessing using STAR Reading and targeted monthly STAR assessing with tier 3 students.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Quarterly assessing using STAR Reading and targeted monthly STAR assessing with tier 3 students.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Quarterly assessing using STAR Reading and targeted monthly STAR assessing with tier 3 students. Quarterly MTSS meetings to discuss student progress/regression with each grade level and corresponding district level staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hines, Melissa, hines.melissa@mybradford.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

UFLI Fluency programming for grades K-2 and pacing/curriculum design centered around B.E.S.T ELA Standards with PD support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Resources for UFLI curriculum focus on phonemic practice through repetition and teacher direct instruction and individual practice with students. Built in spelling assessing is included in the program and occurs weekly for a record book grade.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Team comprised of Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, and Literacy Coach meet to design PD and assess instruction on an observation basis.	Schaefer, Raymond, schaefer.raymond@mybradford.us

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 school uses the PBIS system to intervene and support positive behaviors on campus with all K-5 students. We promote and publish our four main components of quality students: respectful, responsible, ready & safe. We use the 7 Mindsets SEL programming to instruct and support student development. We have a full time instructor on our resource wheel teaching this SEL curriculum to all K-5 students on a weekly basis. We also reward/incentivize attendance/and morning mindset champions via teacher documentation and input.

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

Stakeholders include PBIS team (Principal, AP, CRT) and hospitality team comprised of faculty and staff members. Also, we have a Threat Assessment Team comprised of administration, faculty, staff, and district personnel to address student concerns. SAC meets monthly to address school-based programming and parent outreach programming in order to support community development and student success.