

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Carrollwood 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

Carrollwood Elementary School

3516 MCFARLAND RD, Tampa, FL 33618

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Maryjo Stover

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	47%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (64%) 2020-21: (57%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Hillsborough 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.

Carrollwood Elementary School will be a leader in developing high performing students who are prepared for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Carrollwood Elementary School will prepare students for life.

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
Stover, Mary Jo	Principal	Maintain the campus and the instructional responsibilities of students and staff.
Calve, Christina	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal in monitoring and maintaining the campus and instructional learning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Maryjo Stover

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.*

2

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.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

643

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

6

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

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	102	105	104	118	92	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	623
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	16	25	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	14	22	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	23	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	13	11	13	16	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

Wednesday 8/3/2022

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	104	95	120	99	111	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	10	10	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	104	95	120	99	111	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	11	10	10	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

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%	53%	56%	66%			71%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	61%	61%	65%			56%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	54%	52%	50%			35%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	60%	62%			64%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%	69%	64%	60%			49%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	61%	55%	36%			27%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	49%	51%	63%			66%	50%	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	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	55%	15%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	57%	7%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%
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	37	52	67	43	58	52	20				
ELL	53	59	59	52	67	69	30				
BLK	35	53		38	46						
HSP	63	61	46	62	67	65	55				
MUL	62			54							
WHT	80	73	73	81	75	64	60				
FRL	56	63	56	60	60	61	38				

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	40	52	54	35	50	43	40				
ELL	42	50	50	36	43		18				
BLK	45			52							
HSP	60	66	53	52	59	50	54				
MUL	50			57							
WHT	76	67		74	61		67				
FRL	50	56	42	46	46	35	52				
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	39	44	32	37	37	16	36				
ELL	33	32	18	33	29	22					
ASN	83	60		92	73						
BLK	54	63		50	26	20					
HSP	63	56	30	58	49	32	72				
MUL	64	50		43	30						
WHT	79	54	39	71	53	26	70				
FRL	55	50	31	43	35	28	44				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	517
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
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	61
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	58
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	72
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	57
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?

- All math components saw growth over the prior year's performance.
- Overall math learning gains and BQ learning gains showed substantial growth among almost all subgroups, most notably SWD & ELL
- Science proficiency decreased by 13 percentage points. Losses among all subgroups.
- SWD decreased in ELA proficiency by 3 percentage points, however these students within the BQ gained 13 percentage points.
- ELL Students grew in all components except science

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

- Science, all subgroups
- ELA proficiency among SWD students

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:

- Poor attendance post-covid
- Students lack stamina for rigorous instruction
- Inconsistent science instruction
- Concerns around hands-on science exploration (covid)
- Class coverage (shortage of substitutes/splitting classes)

Actions:

- Focus on Science instruction (Vertical planning, acquisition and application of vocabulary, LTIs, Inquiry Mondays, hands-on investigation)
- Stronger ELA/Science integration
- Science PD for staff
- Vocabulary acquisition strategies PD
- Continue building teachers' capacity to differentiate instruction for all learners
- Use of ELLevation curriculum

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

- Math Proficiency increased by 7 percentage points
- Math Gains increased by 10 percentage points
- Math Bottom Quartile gains increased by 31 percentage points

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

Contributing Factors:

- 3rd grade math proficiency increased by 14 percentage points, to 80%!
- 4th grade math proficiency increased by 12 percentage points
- 5th grade math gains increased by 28 percentage points to 82%!

New Actions:

- Consistent analysis of math monthly data to develop instruction aligned with student needs
- Effective small groups that correlate with subgroup needs
- Small groups based on relevant, timely data
- Strong integration with ESE
- Consistent instructional practices and presentation among grade level teachers
- Math TTD coaching cycles (Individualized PD)
- Additional support from district-level content specialists

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

- Student incentives
- Additional ELP time for bottom quartile students
- Keeping small groups flexible and data-driven
- Ongoing progress monitoring
- Student-led discussions
- Peer/group work
- Scaffolding learning
- PD for new standards and curriculum
- Vertical Planning

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 via peer observation cycles
- PD via Vertical planning (LTIs, science journals, spiraling standards, etc.)
- PD on new curriculum resources
- Strategies to improve vocabulary acquisition and usage
- Individualized PD via TTD and content area specialists
- Ongoing PD on ELL resources
- B.E.S.T. standards
- STEMscopes
- Wonders (intermediate)

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

- ELP tutoring for below level students, possibly by subgroup
- Encouraging departmentalized teachers to regroup students as needed to support differentiation
- Parent Nights - STEAM and Frameworks
- Additional SWD support beyond instructional hours if funding is present

- Enrichment clubs - embedded opportunities for cross-curricular enrichment
- Ensure availability and accessibility of science resources to support ease of teacher use and implementation

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 Science

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

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

We will increase student science proficiency (3 or higher) from 50% to 63% by aligning the instruction and instructional tasks to the rigor of the standards with continuous progress monitoring.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

The goal is that Carrollwood will increase its science proficiency to 63% on the 2022-2023 FSA.

Monitoring:

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

- Quarterly PLCs to discuss data from science forms
- Science coaching and observation cycles
- Evidence of science vocabulary instruction and application
- Evidence of Nature of Science instruction - tools, scientific method, etc.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christina Calve (christina.calve@hcps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

Vertical PLCs to identify trends and connections between standards among grade levels
 Coaching cycles with science DRT
 Performing walk-throughs with science look-fors checklist

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

By ensuring engaging, rigorous, consistent science instruction in all grade levels, we will support scaffolded instructional growth in this area. Regular data meetings following each common assessment will help instructional staff identify students' level of standard mastery. That information will be used to effectively differentiate through foundational scaffolding, additional guided practice, or providing opportunities for application/analysis/ evaluation/creation.

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.

- Common Planning
- Vertical PLCs
- Teacher Observation and Science lessons (science DRT)
- Use of science tools

Inquiry Monday

STEM time

Longterm Investigations

Person Responsible Christina Calve (christina.calve@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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

Our student body is very diverse, with 11.5% being ELL, 49.5% receiving Free or Reduced-Price meals, and 18.5% Students with Disabilities. Differentiating instructional content, process and products by rigor, modality, and presentation style is crucial for meeting the needs of all learners.

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

Our goal for this year is as follows:

- ELA Achievement: 75%
- ELA Learning Gains: 70%
- ELA BQ Learning Gains: 62%
- Math Achievement: 75%
- Math Learning Gains: 70%
- Math BQ Learning Gains: 70%
- Science Achievement: 63%

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

- Regularly reviewing diagnostic data
- Analysis of math monthly data
- Attending district level math PLCs
- Classroom walk-throughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Jo Stover (maryjo.stover@hcps.net)

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

- Differentiation Strategies
- Data-Based Small Groups
- Professional Development
- Coaching cycles with Content Experts

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

Regular data meetings following each common assessment will help instructional staff identify students' level of standard mastery. That information will be used to effectively differentiate through foundational scaffolding, additional guided practice, or providing opportunities for application/analysis/evaluation/creation.

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.

- Use of ELLevation to support ELL Learners
- Common planning among content areas
- Monthly PLCs to analyze common assessments
- Use of realia, visuals and tactile elements in instruction
- Content area coaching cycles
- Evidence of content area vocabulary instruction and application
- Evidence of print rich environment, word wall in use
- Evidence of differentiated content, process, and product by rigor, modality, and presentation style

Person Responsible

Mary Jo Stover (maryjo.stover@hcps.net)

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.

- Ongoing training/Professional Development on Frameworks (SEL). Pilot classrooms initiated Community Building Sessions the prior year and are expanding to additional classrooms this year.
- Character trait word of the month is presented over the morning show. Teachers are provided lessons that they can incorporate with their students in addition to the school counselor presenting monthly lessons.
- Mindful Learning Time is incorporated into the daily schedule for teachers to meet with their students at the start of the day.
- Positive Behavior Intervention Support program is being implemented school wide and grade level teachers meet monthly to review behavior data and to plan for quarterly incentive celebrations.
- Restorative practice is conducted monthly for a Behavior Support Students and used after a suspension. Students who are having a difficult time emotionally, academically, or socially are provided a Check and Connect mentor.

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

Veronica Kreisher, Guidance Counselor: Leading Frameworks initiative. Leading monthly lessons around positive character traits, Recognition of students that exemplify monthly Character Trait, "Caught Being Good"

Fitzgerald & Souverain, PBIS Committee Chairs: This committee regularly meetings to review school-wide behaviors/behavioral expectations, plans school-wide behavior incentives/activities

Amanda Rio, Social Worker - Mindful Monday presentation on morning show

Calve/Stover - Acknowledgement of positive behaviors on morning show, Daily OWLS Expectations (PBIS), Character Trait of the Month