

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Hunter's Green Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Hunter's Green Elementary School

9202 HIGHLAND OAK DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

Principal: Nicole Libby

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2011

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Hunter's Green Elementary School

9202 HIGHLAND OAK DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[ 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	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

### 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.**

The educators, staff and volunteers of Hunter's Green Elementary School are committed to:

- \* Providing students with the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to become productive contributors to society.
- \* Actively involving the home, school, and community in providing resources to meet the needs of individual students in developing traits for self-fulfillment and participation in the school climate that will carry forth into an ever-changing global society.
- \* Continually assessing and refining the educational processes to produce lifelong learners able to challenge the future.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Hunter's Green Elementary School students will become productive contributors to society as lifelong learners and decision makers living in harmony with self and others.

### 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
Holt, Gaye	Principal	Mrs. Holt is responsible to oversee all of the student data and to help with the improvement.
Greenwood, Kristina	Instructional Coach	Dr. Greenwood analyzes the data in reading and then works with teachers to improve that data.
Henson, Troy	Assistant Principal	Mr. Henson supervises teachers to improve their teacher effectiveness.
Goldberg, Lourdes	Other	Mrs. Goldberg monitors our ELL students and then provides instruction based on their needs.
Harris, Chelsie	Attendance/ Social Work	Ms. Harris monitors attendance and then provides interventions to those students needing assistance.
Jefferson, Yaritza	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Jefferson works with our ESE students and teachers. She looks for areas of need and then helps provide support.
Koehler, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Koehler is designated to help with our math program. She analyzes data and then works with teachers to improve their teacher effectiveness in math.
LeBlanc, Keli	School Counselor	Mrs. Leblanc works with our teachers and students with social emotional learning.
Provonscha-Bucher, Leslie	Psychologist	Mrs. Bucher helps identify students that need additional support and guides the teachers with RTI/MTSS.
SequeiraTorres, Diana	Instructional Media	Mrs. Sequeira Torres is an additional resource to help teachers and students with reading.
Truman, Tiffany	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Truman is a cochair for our SAC.
Corripio, Krista	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Corripio is a cochair for our SAC.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Monday 6/13/2011, Nicole Libby

**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**

46

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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	105	117	85	118	129	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	676
Attendance below 90 percent	9	9	5	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	0	4	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Thursday 10/29/2020

### 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	114	99	108	129	123	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	681
Attendance below 90 percent	9	4	6	10	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	21	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		1	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times		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	114	99	108	129	123	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	681
Attendance below 90 percent	9	4	6	10	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	18	21	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		1	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

**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	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times		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	72%	52%	57%	53%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	55%	58%	56%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	50%	53%	49%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	54%	63%	56%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	65%	57%	62%	53%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	46%	51%	39%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	50%	53%	57%	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	74%	52%	22%	58%	16%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
	2018	40%	51%	-11%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	54%	34%	62%	26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	55%	4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	57%	9%	64%	2%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
	2018	48%	54%	-6%	61%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	51%	12%	53%	10%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
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	39	26	12	37	45	35	23				
ELL	64	58		60	61						
ASN	87	83		92	83						
BLK	63	59	40	66	49	33	54				
HSP	60	54	33	64	68	50	61				
MUL	79	63		79	63		100				
WHT	78	61	36	79	70	35	68				
FRL	60	52	36	59	55	27	58				
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	27	39	25	18	21	6	17				
ELL	28	40	47	33	21	16					
ASN	56	67		56	58						
BLK	53	55	73	42	35	15	56				
HSP	48	44	40	50	38	25	21				
MUL	88	90		56	80						
WHT	67	53	29	72	60	21	59				

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
FRL	45	48	51	45	41	25	35				
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	26	38	33	26	35	33	27				
ELL	21	34	40	29	38	34	11				
ASN	68	62		63	46						
BLK	45	56	58	47	43	29	46				
HSP	40	49	48	40	48	35	36				
MUL	67			73							
WHT	66	60	30	73	62	64	83				
FRL	38	46	50	44	48	39	37				

### 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	62
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	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	66
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	60
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	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	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.**

The data component showing the lowest performance on FSA 2019 were the bottom quartile students making learning gains in both reading and math.

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

All scores increased on 2019 FSA.

**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.**

HGE was above the state average in all areas, however, fifth grade ELA and Math had the lowest rise in numbers.

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

HGE showed improvement in all areas. The school had a very focused and purposeful action plan to meet the needs of all students. Teachers planned using the Florida Standards and based their lessons on them. For the 2019 school year, students in grades 3, 4, and 5 used I-Ready books to help master the standards in ELA, and then students in grades 3, 4, and 5 participated in the district's monthly math assessments. Teachers analyzed the data monthly and retaught specific standards as needed.

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

Our Students with Disabilities had a score of 31%.

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

1. Increase the scores for Students with Disabilities in both ELA and Math.
2. Increase the scores for students in the Bottom Quartile for both ELA and Math.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** After analyzing data, the ESSA Subgroup of Students with Disabilities show a low score of 31%, which shows that most of our ESE students are not making adequate gains in reading and math. Our students will receive various methods of rigorous, differentiated instruction including small group and individualized practice to meet the needs of every learner.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome is to increase achievement and learning gains as measured by state and district assessments as of May 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Gaye Holt (gaye.holt@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** To ensure the success of each student, all teachers are expected to identify students with disabilities, analyze purposeful, relevant information, and then select interventions and strategies based on individual student needs to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** This strategy is based on individual student needs in order to increase student achievement, primarily students with disabilities. The need for this strategy is based on our school data.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Data chats and updates conducted by Administration after each diagnostic, interim, form test, or district assessment.
2. Count sheets shared through Office 365 with each grade level, updated by leadership.
3. Students will receive small group/individual instruction daily that is based on their needs.
4. Guided reading will be purposeful and effective with explicit interventions and strategies based on professional development trainings.
5. All SWD will receive two guided reading groups daily.
6. School-wide RTI will be implemented by grade levels based on student needs and standards.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

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

Our students will receive various methods of rigorous, differentiated instruction including small group and individualized practice, to meet the needs of every learner.

**Measurable Outcome:** The outcome is to increase achievement and learning gains as measured by state and district assessments as of May 2021.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Gaye Holt (gaye.holt@hcps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards based instruction will be backwards planned to include specific learning targets and connected tasks that are aligned with the full rigor of the standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** This strategy is based on individual student needs in order to increase student achievement. By designing instruction with the end in mind, students and teachers both understand the desired goal. Steps and revisions can be made along the way in order to meet the individual needs of each student to successfully reach the goal/learning target.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will participate in collaborative planning with their teams in order to identify the learning targets of each standard and to understand their content complexity.
2. Teachers will collaborate to create common assessments aligned with the standards.
3. Grade levels will calibrate the quality work to ensure equity across the grade level.
4. Teachers will create learning objectives that include content, action, and evidence of learning, so that students are able to articulate their learning.

**Person Responsible** Gaye Holt (gaye.holt@hcps.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The leadership team will continuously review and analyze data, share with the staff, and identify areas that still need focused on.**

**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.

At Hunter's Green Elementary, we have high expectations for all students. Students come to Hunter's Green to learn in a safe and orderly environment. If a child does not know how to read, we teach. If a child does not know how to multiply, we teach. At Hunter's Green, we use that same philosophy when it comes to student behavior. Hunter's Green is a PBIS school that focuses on learning and implementing growth mindset strategies to all of our students. We will be using a school-wide behavior plan to ensure that all students are showing their panther pride daily. Research shows that children need to know what is expected of them and they need to be taught what that looks like. We will have school-wide behavior expectations posted throughout the school. Students earn Panther Bucks for following the expectations. Then they can use their cash to buy items from the Panther Mart, earn a VIP event, or participate in a school-wide behavior incentive.

Staff members can also earn Panther Bucks for going above and beyond their normal classroom duty. This can then be used to purchase items throughout the year, or they can save their bucks to be used at a silent auction at the end of the year.

#### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.