Cork Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cork Elementary School

3501 N CORK RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sherri Lyn Black

Start Date for this Principal: 6/18/2020

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)	100%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 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.

Table of Contents

Cork Elementary School

3501 N CORK RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	76%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

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 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.

Cork Elementary exemplifies a safe and nurturing environment where people from diverse cultures and beliefs come together to build confidence, excel in learning, strengthen inter-personal relationships, and be a stellar example of our families, community, and district.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life.

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
Black, Sherri	Principal	Leadership team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal / ELP Coordinator Guidance Counselor SAC Chair School Psychologist School Social Worker/ Attendance Committee Representative Academic Coaches (Reading, Math) ESE Lead ESOL Resource Teacher PLC Liaisons for each grade level and/or content area The purpose of the core Leadership Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within thecontent/grade level teams. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through Leadership Team Meetings and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County. HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities

principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved
by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping
to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of
ongoing professional development.
Compensation is grounded in a performance-based salary structure that explicitly ties salary increases to sustained high-level performance, while career ladder positions, such
as Instructional Mentors, are available to effective educators. The base teacher salary
schedule is designed to provide substantial increases in compensation to teachers who
have demonstrated positive student impact.
Once hired, teacher induction and teacher retention are supported through fully-released
instructional mentors assigned to every new educator for up to two years to increase effectiveness and decrease recidivism. Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate
educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in
response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/18/2020, Sherri Lyn Black

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.*
2

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

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)	100%
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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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.	

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	89	120	103	108	85	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	7	20	11	17	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	15	3	13	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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

Friday 10/30/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	11	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	10	27	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	46	56	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	11	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	10	27	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	46	56	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	56%	52%	57%	51%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	55%	58%	52%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	50%	53%	46%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	54%	63%	51%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	57%	62%	52%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	51%	40%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	50%	53%	59%	48%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
	2018	62%	53%	9%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	50%	55%	-5%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
	2018	53%	51%	2%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
	2018	59%	57%	2%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	51%	11%	53%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	57%	52%	5%	55%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	20	56	56	30	51	33	35				
ELL	38	49	52	41	58	61	27				
HSP	45	56	51	46	59	60	37				
WHT	63	60	56	63	69	50	77				
FRL	48	55	53	50	60	54	57				
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	20	42	45	35	37	30	22				
ELL	36	44	44	32	36	33	26				
HSP	42	50	45	42	44	33	48				
WHT	67	58	55	63	57	44	68				
FRL	49	55	53	48	52	40	51				
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	16	31	39	26	31	29	21				
ELL	19	31	31	33	44	46	36				
HSP	29	42	47	39	49	47	38				
MUL	50			67							
WHT	69	60	50	59	56	32	75				
FRL	43	46	47	44	48	36	51				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	63
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	54
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.

Previously, the lowest performance was seen in ELA Achievement Points (56). This is a trend, as little growth has been shown in proficiency over time.

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

Previously, gains were made in all areas. However, only 39% of ESE students were proficient which places them below the 41% range for ESSA.

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.

Cork's data reflects a deficit in Math Proficiency. We fell six percentage points below the state average in 2019. One barrier may have been the lack of resources and teachers needed further training in presenting lessons using the CRA (Concrete-Representational-Abstract) Model. Fact Fluency also seems to be a contributing factor to this gap.

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

Math learning gains in the bottom quartile showed significant gains (+15) in 2019. Most of the points gained were from fifth grade. Improved teacher attendance was a major contributing factor. Additionally, the use of the standards based, mini-formative assessments to track progress helped teachers differentiate instruction.

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

Only 39% of our ESE students are proficient. Many of these students are found in the bottom quartile and score Level 1s on the FSA.

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

1. Planning for Differentiated (Standards Based) Instruction
2. Vocabulary Instruction
3. Fact Fluency in Math
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards Based Planning for Differentiation of Instruction is a focus as our data shows that proficiency in ELA has been stagnant for the past two years. Additionally, ESSA reports that our ESE subgroup falls below 41% (Cork = 39%).
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency scores in all categories by 5% for all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful grouping of students and differentiated learning activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers will plan and implement explicit differentiated lessons and create an environment of tiered activities to promote grade level proficiency in reading and math. i-Ready diagnostic reports were used to make this determination.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional development on teacher-led small group instruction in reading and math.
2. Continue the use of classroom "Look fors" as evidence of planning for differentiated instruction as learned from the 2019 book study, "How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms" by C. Tomlinson.
3. Frequent classroom walk-throughs
4. Use of standards based mini-formative assessments to track progress
5. Quarterly data chats with teachers about student progress

Person Responsible	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Explicit vocabulary instruction is an additional area of focus as it is a common deficit across all grade levels based on 2020 i-Ready data. Our school population consists of 52% Hispanic students and 8% Migrant students with 25% of them receiving ELL support.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase vocabulary development for all students across every grade level and in all content areas by 5% on i-Ready Instructional Grouping Report.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful grouping of students and differentiated learning centers/activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers will plan and implement explicit vocabulary lessons and create an environment of word consciousness throughout all content areas to promote grade level vocabulary proficiency as measured by i-Ready. Vocabulary instruction will be visible by the posting of anchor charts, word walls, and explicit vocabulary instruction integrated within teacher-led small groups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Explicit vocabulary instruction in the literacy block with a focus on student application in all content areas.
2. Reading focus will be on word study especially in the content areas.
3. Reading Coach will continue instructional planning with each grade level.
4. During teacher-led small group instruction, vocabulary will be highlighted.
5. Reading Coach will provide professional development on vocabulary instruction during Content Cadre meetings.
6. If possible, school-wide vocabulary parade with parent participation.

Person Responsible	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Our mission statement is long, but truly reflects how we feel about educating our Cork students, "Cork Elementary exemplifies a safe and nurturing environment where people form diverse cultures and beliefs come together to build confidence, excel in learning, strengthen inter-personal relationships, and to be a stellar example of our families, community and district." We use the 7 Habits of Happy Kids (based on Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People) to teach our students how to become self-reliant, take initiative, plan ahead, set and track goals, complete their assignments, prioritize their time, manage their emotions, be considerate of others, express their viewpoint persuasively, resolve conflicts, find creative solutions, value differences, work together, and lead a balanced life. Teachers incorporate the habits into morning meetings and daily instruction. Community (grade level) meetings are held monthly to teach and ingrain the habits.

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: Differentiation**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**