Shore Elementary Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Shore Elementary Magnet School

1908 E 2ND AVE, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cheri Bollinger

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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

Shore Elementary Magnet School

1908 E 2ND AVE, Tampa, FL 33605

[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 KG-5	Yes	84%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

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 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.

Shore Elementary Magnet school students will use the arts to shine academically in reading and math to be successful leaders within the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Shore's ARTS star students will be given quality and purposeful instruction, driven by the standards that will
result in student proficiency and growth.

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
Bollinger, Cheri	Principal	• Sets the vision, mission and expectations for the school • Leading school to meet or exceed state academic standards, including benchmark scores in standardized testing • Budgeting and managing school expenses • Conducting teacher and staff evaluations • Planning school events such as open houses, back-to-school nights, fairs • Assigning teaching schedules • Supervising custodial workers, guidance counselors, teachers, school nurse, bookkeepers, school nutrition staff and students. • Disciplining delinquent students • Setting up systems to identify students with special needs • Supporting faculty with training, feedback, enrichment and goal setting to build capacity in meeting student needs • Maintaining accurate academic records • Building relationships with the parents, community and business partners to support all Shore initiatives • Hiring faculty and other support staff • Preparing for the upcoming school year during the summer • Meeting with superintendents and school board members

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Cheri Bollinger

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.*
1

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (42%)
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	63	64	71	69	63	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	403
Attendance below 90 percent	4	3	1	5	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	1	1	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	5	29	17	14	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
Course failure in Math	19	37	46	21	36	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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
Tuesday 6/23/2020

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	41	75	79	84	73	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	12	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	3	4	11	5	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	18	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	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	41	75	79	84	73	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	12	8	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	3	4	11	5	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
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	18	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	53%	52%	57%	50%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	55%	58%	54%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	50%	53%	43%	51%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	50%	54%	63%	46%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	57%	62%	38%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	46%	51%	29%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	50%	53%	37%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	55%	54%	1%	56%	-1%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	57%	3%	64%	-4%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	36%	54%	-18%	60%	-24%
	2018	40%	54%	-14%	61%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
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	23	42	54	35	42						
ELL	25	80		33	70						
BLK	50	45	26	48	47	27	51				
HSP	50	72	80	52	59		50				
MUL	63	58		44	50						
WHT	67	73		57	64						
FRL	51	56	54	49	50	33	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
SWD	7	43	50	21	29	23	10				
BLK	52	54	60	51	46	25	30				
HSP	49	57		51	52		50				
MUL	61	62		44	54						
WHT	57	65		65	47		60				
FRL	50	56	56	51	49	35	42				
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	15	33	23	27	50	45					
ELL	23			23							
BLK	47	48	44	46	40	33	30				
HSP	49	69		40	26		40				
MUL	53	58		47	50						
WHT	65	47		57	47						
FRL	49	53	45	46	34	19	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	51
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	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	411
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	56
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	42
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	62
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	54
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	65
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	53
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.

Our lowest performance were in the categories of the bottom 25% in reading and math for the FSA. The trend data indicates that this component of our overall data increases or decreases yearly by 3 - 5 percentage points - no consistency or sustainability of student performance . One major contributing factor is that too many students are reading below grade level expectations, which negatively impacts them on a test in which most of the questions are written at or above grade level. Our children have difficulty decoding words. Comprehension, fluency, etc...., all of those major components of reading are not utilized during the reading process, hence flatlined or decreased scores at every grade level. Some of the contributing factors of the low performance in math is due to the complexity level of the math test, not enough hands on experiences, and large deficits in reading for many of our 3rd through

5th grade students, primarily our students with disabilities. We do believe that the implementation of intentional strategic planning using assessments to guide instruction will develop stronger readers in grades KG - 2nd, which will positively impact our 3rd - 5th grade ELA and Math classes.

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

Our lowest performance were in the categories of the bottom 25% in reading and math. School data trends show that Math has been consistently low over the last few years. Some of the contributing factors of the low performance in math is due to the complexity level of the math test, not enough hands on experiences, and large deficits in reading for many of our 3rd through 5th grade students, primarily our students with disabilities. Intentional and Strategic plans must be implemented at every grade level. 4th grade math improved the greatest, but 3rd and 5th either remained stagnant or went down, so we must understand the points needed to improve - moving buckets and/or the higher performing students must either increase proficiency levels or increase total number of scale score points within levels 3 and 4.

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.

The biggest gap when compared to the state average on FSA is ELA and Math (lowest 25%) learning gains. The Math decreased the most, and our school's data lags behind both district and state data. When developing plans this year, we must be more intentional and strategic when moving this group of students, to outpace the district and the state. Our plans must be laser focused and the resources we utilize must be on point to not only capture needed points in this area, but to improve student performance within every subgroup, especially SWD's.

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

Science learning gains on SSA showed the most improvement from 42% to 53%. Structured collaborative planning time was implemented to deconstruct standards and to determine the most effective delivery strategies. Scheduled data chats were held to discuss standard based assessment data to help teachers use data to make instructional decisions and ELA blocks included science nonfiction text in the curriculum.

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

Potential areas of concern include ELA and Math. There will continue to be a strong emphasis in the area of reading to ensure the proficiency in this area of focus. When the proficiency in ELA increases, all other data components will also increase, including that of our SWD subgroup population. Our data also shows that 5th grade Science data increases as 5th grade ELA data increases. If we implement intentionally focused, strategic instructional plans based on current data points in all 3 - 5 grade classrooms with fidelity, then we will improve in learning gains in ELA from 54% to 60% and Math from 51% to 57% on the FSA.

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency and learning gains in grade 3-5
2. Increase Math proficiency and learning gains in grade 3-5
3. Increase lowest 25% ELA learning gains
4. Increase lowest 25% Math learning gains
5. Increase SWD subgroup not meeting the 41% or higher federal index

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase ELA proficiency, leaning gains and lowest percentile gains From our 2020 Spring Inquiry Cycle, we discovered the need for more data driven discussions using student work to drive instructional conversations. We will continue to set high expectations and use standard grade-level appropriate curriculum and assessments to deliver instruction engaging students in their learning. Through strong core instruction, productive student participation and setting student goals, we will see an increase in learning gains across all subject areas in all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve overall FSA achievement in ELA from 53% to 59%, ELA learning gains from 54% to 60% and Lowest 25% gains from 49% to 54% in order to support academic achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheri Bollinger (cheri.bollinger@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Quality core instruction (Visible Leaning for Literacy)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students have quality core instruction, then need for additional intervention declines so students learn more.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use academic coaches to collaborate, monitor and assess quality instruction as to improve overall student achievement in all areas. Utilize coaches to implement effective Common Planning sessions and PD sessions and provide classroom support through coaching cycles to develop teacher skill set.
2. Utilize backwards planning aligning assessment criteria to the high quality standard based core instruction
3. Teachers will analyze ongoing data to determine areas of specific need for each student.
4. Progress monitoring through PLC's logs, classroom walk through,, LTM observations, Academic Coaches logs, technology resources, formative and summative assessments and state assessments.
5. Teachers will use various programs to support students, including iReady, SIPPS and Achieve 3000

Person Responsible	Cheri Bollinger (cheri.bollinger@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	From our 2020 Spring Inquiry Cycle, we discovered the need for more data driven discussions using student work to drive instructional conversations. We will continue to set high expectations and use standard grade-level appropriate curriculum and assessments to deliver instruction engaging students in their learning. Through strong core instruction, productive student participation and setting student goals, we will see an increase in learning gains across all subject areas in all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve overall FSA achievement in Math from 50% to 56%, Math learning gains from 51% to 57% and Lowest 25% gains from 31% to 374% in order to support academic achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheri Bollinger (cheri.bollinger@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will focus on implementing explicit and systematic standards based instruction to increase student achievement MATH
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	With explicit instruction, teachers model a skill and verbalize their thinking process, using clear and concise language. This gives students opportunities for guided and independent practice—including practicing the new skill and also reviewing skills that they've learned in the past. Explicit math instruction can improve students' ability to perform operations and solve word problems.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use academic coaches to collaborate, monitor and assess quality instruction as to improve overall student achievement in all areas. Utilize coaches to implement effective Common Planning sessions and PD sessions and provide classroom support through coaching cycles to develop teacher skill set.
2. Utilize backwards planning aligning assessment criteria to the high quality standard based core instruction
3. Teachers will analyze ongoing data to determine areas of specific need for each student.
4. Progress monitoring through PLC's logs, classroom walk through,, LTM observations, Academic Coaches logs, technology resources, formative and summative assessments and state assessments.
5. Teachers will use various programs to support students, including iReady

Person Responsible	Cheri Bollinger (cheri.bollinger@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our school will stay focused on the priorities and monitor progress toward the goals. The subgroup SWD will be monitored closely. Teachers and students will create, implement and monitor goals to maximize achievement. In addition to our curriculum goals, we are also focusing on the Social and Emotional Learning environment of our school. Throughout this plan's implementation an appreciation of multicultural diversity is interwoven. We know that school climate is dependent on positive relationships, cultural sensitivity, as well as the instructional expectations to meet the needs of every child that enable all students to reach their highest potential.

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.

Through our Parent Family Engagement Plan, we will build relationships with our families and community stakeholders. We provide high-quality instruction for our students and increase collaboration and communication with our parents and community. We use many forms to communicate such as student planners, parent letters, telephone calls, emails, quarterly parent nights, parent conferences, open house, achieve assemblies and website to support the family and the student. In effort to build capacity for parental involvement and help support student achievement, we will build positive relationships through our PTA, SAC, and school wide programs. In addition we are building a restorative school community by providing breakfast in the classrooms using restorative conversations and character building.

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