

Pasco County Schools

Fox Hollow Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

<https://fhес.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Pitkoff

Start Date for this Principal: 5/2/2016

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 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	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
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 Pasco 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

<https://fh.es.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">87%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">48%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

At FHES, we are committed to:
 Building and maintaining strong relationships
 Inspiring all
 Ensuring safety
 Believing in all
 Being a champion
 Showing empathy towards all

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Owl" Be Your Champion!

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
Kinzie, Karyn	Principal	Our school leadership team is comprised of: A PLC Facilitator from each grade level team (PK-5) and ESE Coaching Team School Intervention Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 5/2/2016, Jessica Pitkoff

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
2019-20 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	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	77	104	73	83	110	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	15	30	14	18	21	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Monday 8/31/2020

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	94	73	76	87	71	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	14	18	23	16	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	7	9	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	16	3	17	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	5	12	12	18	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	5	13	10	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

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	94	73	76	87	71	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	14	18	23	16	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	7	9	4	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	16	3	17	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	5	13	10	12	10	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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

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	44%	58%	57%	33%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	56%	58%	48%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	54%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	41%	60%	63%	40%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	54%	61%	62%	59%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	53%	53%	39%	49%	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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	40%	57%	-17%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
	2018	41%	55%	-14%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%
	2018	37%	56%	-19%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	59%	-22%	62%	-25%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	62%	-18%	64%	-20%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
	2018	37%	58%	-21%	61%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	56%	-21%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	21	35	36	23	45	38	31				
ELL											
BLK	17	10		27							
HSP	43	43		32	54	38	32				
MUL	23			45							
WHT	48	49	71	45	53	31	55				
FRL	41	40	47	38	53	42	42				
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	12	39	41	12	32	20					
BLK	18	64		14	60						
HSP	41	55	64	31	35	20	36				
MUL	36			36							
WHT	42	57	57	52	63	40	36				
FRL	36	57	65	36	54	44	29				
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	5	41	50	17	50	40	8				
ELL	17	30		17	70						
BLK	30	50		22	36						
HSP	25	40	46	29	60	64	24				
WHT	38	49	56	47	63	46	50				
FRL	29	46	52	36	57	55	35				

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	44

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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

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	18
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	50
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	43
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 2019 data component showing the lowest performance was Math Lowest Quartile (38%), as well as Math Achievement (41%). We will continue to strengthen Math routines and increase student engagement through Kagan structures. It is an area that continue to need direct focus, specifically for our scholars that require Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction to close the gaps.

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

The data that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA Learning Gains (57% to 42%) and ELA Lowest Quartile (64% to 48%). We spent a lot of our time analyzing student data and creating groups of scholars who needed tiered supports, but our practices did not strategically focus on how to close the gap for these scholars.

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.

When compared to the state average, 5th grade Math had the greatest gap with 26%. Also, 3rd grade Math with 25%. Math is an area that needs direct focus, specifically for our scholars that are in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction to close the gaps.

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

5th grade Science data showed the most improvement. We implemented a Science Lab setting where classes visited once a month for hands-on science lessons modeled and/or co-taught by the Coach. We also ensured time was carved out to teach Science content every day.

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

Two areas of concern that are reflected on EWS data are Attendance and Level 1s in ELA and Math. We will continue to focus on increasing attendance by way of building and maintaining positive relationships with families, as well as increase student engagement practices.

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

1. Increase in ELA Learning Gains
2. Increase in ELA Lowest Quartile
3. Focus on SWD in all content
4. Focus on Black/African American and Multi-Racial scholars in all content

We will do this through increased student engagement practices, a focus on tiered supports and writing across the curriculum.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: It is imperative that our teachers provide high impact instruction to our scholars, so they are college, career and life ready. In 2019-2020, our overall Core Action data showed 53% YES (51% in 18-19). More specifically, 37% YES in Core Action 2 (51% in 18-19) and 41% YES in Core Action 3 (26% in 18-19).

Measurable Outcome: By May 2021, using our Core Action Walkthrough Tool, 60% of teachers will show evidence that they are planning, delivering, assessing and monitoring standards-based instruction matched to the rigor of the standards, with a focus on Core Action 2 and 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Core Connections PD and further implementation
Kagan Cooperative Learning Refresher and Day 4
Kagan Coaching sessions (4 times throughout the year)
PLC Facilitator Training/Refresher

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We must continue to increase scholar engagement through high quality, standards-based instruction to ensure our scholars are given every opportunity to learn at high levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. New to FHES teachers will attend Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures Day 1 on 9/12/20.
2. All FHES Instructional Staff will attend Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures Day 4 on 10/10/20.
3. New to FHES teachers attended a full day Initial Core Connections Training on 7/17/20.
4. All Intermediate Teachers completed a Core Connections Refresher Webinar the week of July 20th with a virtual debrief on 7/23/20.
5. Administration will use Core Connections and Kagan look-for tools when conducting walkthroughs.
6. Additional in-house coaching will be provided after walkthroughs occur.

Person Responsible Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our Winter MAP Data indicates that we are 48% proficient in ELA (30% in 18-19) and 46% in Math (38% in 18-19). On FSA 18-19, we were 44% proficient in ELA (40% in 17-18) and 41% in Math (42% in 17-18). We are looking forward to analyzing our Spring MAP data!

Measurable Outcome: By May 2021, PLCs will create, implement and monitor instruction in Reading and Mathematics, including Tier 2 and Tier 3, which will increase our proficiency FSA data by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PLC Facilitator Training/Refresher; Strengthen PLCs to lead with Guiding Questions
 Continue monthly SIT meetings to monitor Lowest 35%
 Tighten SBIT processes

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is important to ensure all stakeholders are involved in the success of our scholars, therefore, we have a variety of staff members on our Student Intervention Team (SIT). This team will continue to analyze our Lowest 35%. The SIT is also tightening up the TBIT and SBIT processes to ensure that our scholars' needs are being met and their gaps are closing. The role of the PLC Facilitator has to be one that leads the grade level team to data driven instructional decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

TBIT/SBIT Staff Training on 7/14/20
 TBIT Train-the-Trainer for PLC Facilitators and ESE Support Facilitators on 9/18/20
 Monthly TBIT PLCs (Week of: 9/21, 10/26, 11/16, 12/14, 1/25, 2/22, 3/22, 4/26)

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our Gallup Employee Engagement survey data decreased from 4.04 to 3.77. However, we only had 53 staff members take the survey. We decreased in Student Hope from 28% to 25% and increased in Student Engagement from 51% to 53%. The three items that showed a significant decline that we are committed to focusing on are:
 o The adults at my school care about me (4.08 to 3.86).
 o In the last seven days, I have learned something interesting at school (3.95 to 3.39).
 o I have a mentor who encourages my development (3.86 to 3.24).

Measurable Outcome: By October 2020, the grand mean of our Gallup Employee Engagement survey will increase .08 from 3.77 to 3.85. The percentage of Student Hope will increase from 28% to 35% and Student Engagement will increase from 51% to 60% on the Gallup Student survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Continue Conscious Discipline learning and implementation; Continue E-Course Sessions and Summer PD
 Additional Behavior Specialist and/or SSAP with SIG to focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We must ensure that our school is a safe and positive place for scholars to learn. Our staff needs to have an understanding of the trauma our scholars experience each and every day while maintaining high expectations for their success. When scholars feel safe, they are free from judgement and insecurity. However, in order for our scholars to feel that way, our staff has to feel safe, too, and remain in the executive state when working with our scholars.

Action Steps to Implement

New staff participated in initial Conscious Discipline Training (Day 1 and Day 2) on 7/13/20 and 7/14/20. All staff participated in Conscious Discipline Training (Day 3 and Day 4) on 7/15/20 and 7/16/20. We have created a CDAT (Conscious Discipline Action Team) of all staff interested in school-wide CD implementation (as a model for staff to observe). Our school is part of a feeder-pattern committed to CD implementation. We will meet quarterly to discuss CD implementation in our schools.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The SLT will continue working on school improvement, specifically monitoring school-wide trends in our specific areas of focus.

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.

Providing a positive school culture and environment is a strength at Fox Hollow. We believe in creating a school family and ensuring we provide a safe place for our scholars and their families, as well as staff and community members/volunteers. We understand the need for our families to work to provide for their family, so involvement regarding physical presence on campus is difficult, however, families are available and willing to provide input, thoughts and support to improve our school.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00