

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Kids Community College Riverview South (K 12)



2021-22 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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Kids Community College Riverview South (K 12)

10030 MATHOG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Katrina Evans

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2020-21 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Kids Community College Riverview South (K 12)

10030 MATHOG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	69%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	B

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.

We are "dedicated to the well-being and educational success of every child". We use Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligence as the basis of our approach and the foundation of our system of individualized instruction for each student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kid's Community College will integrate research based best practices at home, at school and in the community and position itself as the market leader in early, primary and secondary education and caregiving by partnering with parents, school districts, early childhood coalitions and the community to offer the highest quality, cutting edge instruction and learning system in the industry.

We will continue to be aware of market trends and make changes, as needed, to remain competitive and consistently offer the best in service quality.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Seder, Karen	Director - Lower School	K-8

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/10/2010, Katrina Evans

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.*

0

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

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

697

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

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

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	54	55	53	53	65	64	69	55	81	41	34	38	35	697	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	2	0	1	0	0	10	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	8	14	2	8	3	12	15	0	68	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	9	20	6	15	4	0	0	0	66	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	10	21	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	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	3	1	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	1	2	0	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

Monday 9/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

2020-21 - 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	54	54	54	54	64	69	67	85	66	0	0	0	0	567	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	0	1	0	4	5	13	3	0	0	0	0	31	
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	7	2	0	0	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	9	0	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	17	5	0	0	0	0	40	

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	4	6	1	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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				63%	57%	61%	60%	59%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	56%	59%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	52%	54%	43%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				61%	55%	62%	60%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains				57%	57%	59%	40%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	49%	52%	30%	47%	52%
Science Achievement				61%	50%	56%	53%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				98%	77%	78%	96%	79%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
06	2021					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
07	2021					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	52%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
08	2021					
	2019	68%	53%	15%	56%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	57%	-11%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	55%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
07	2021					
	2019	83%	62%	21%	54%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	25%	31%	-6%	46%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	66%	51%	15%	53%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	59%	47%	12%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	67%	31%	71%	27%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	76%	63%	13%	61%	15%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

NWEA MAP used for K-8 Reading, Science and Math; USA Test Prep Benchmark Exams used for CIVICS, 8th Science and Algebra / Geometry

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			37/97%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			33/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			30/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			42/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81%	72%	40/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	85%	81%	42/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78%	65%	40/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	70%	56%	40/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48%	46%	31/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59%	49%	31/45%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45%	26%	56/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67%	55%	37/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	69%	44/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64%	57%	55/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61%	59%	45/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	60%	70%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76%	68%	43/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	76%	65%	12/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	62%	68%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	39	52	44	39	52	58	29				
ELL	53	64		41	73						
ASN	79			79							
BLK	58	58	35	48	40	40	26	72	60		
HSP	55	53	42	53	52	46	43	53	57		
MUL	53	67		63	67						
WHT	68	63	71	62	55	39	64	85	78		
FRL	52	47	39	45	45	50	37	60	57		
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	16	30	40	34	56	67	25				
ELL	58			50							

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
BLK	55	52	41	55	57	48	43	100	92		
HSP	56	55	50	51	52	38	62	94	67		
MUL	67	76		71	67						
WHT	72	66	61	68	60	63	73	100	83		
FRL	45	48	47	53	49	36	37	95	80		
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	23	21	18	35	21	21	18				
BLK	51	58	46	49	30	29	36	94	64		
HSP	60	48	57	58	40	30	54	96	75		
MUL	47	41		59	47						
WHT	66	52	33	67	43	24	63	97	74		
FRL	48	49	41	48	36	33	41	100	65		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Science scores are down school-wide. 5th grade scores were down in all subjects.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

5th Grade Reading and ESE

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

New staff in 5th grade - changes have been made to more experienced staff in Math and more engagement in ELA. More resources will be provided in 5th ELA to ensure effective instructional strategies and time on task.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

civics showed consistent growth throughout the year. 6th grade math scored consistently higher than historical.
4th grade scores are up. 3rd grade reading proficiency is high.

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

Returning staff in 6th grade math. High engagement and seasoned personnel in Civics. Middle school additional time with Intensive Reading and Math making a difference with intervention.

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

Reading focus school-wide. Focus on reading strategies in all content areas.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Increase time in grade 5 reading support and intervention. School wide PD regarding reading in the content areas

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

Focus on small group reading intervention in elementary and find additional time for reading in 4th/5th with struggling readers. Schedule adjustments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 5th grade ELA Scores were low in Progress Monitoring Data and student gains in 5th grade ELA. Only 38% of 5th grade students scored a level 3 or above on the 2021 ELA FSA. 10% of students in grades K-2 are currently not on track to scores a level 3 or above on the grade 3 ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Maintain Grade 3 FSA proficiency of 72% or more.
Increase percentage of 5th grade students scoring level 3 or higher on ELA FSA to 58%
Maintain Grade 6 ELA FSA proficiency of 72% or more
Increase Grade 8 ELA FSA proficiency to 60% or more

Monitoring: Monitoring for ELA in all grades will be done with iReady three times a year. Goals will be monitored for student gains throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Karen Seder (karen.seder1@charter.hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Monitor instruction in the ELA block to ensure instruction in both reading and writing is designed and implemented according to research-based principles.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Monitoring instruction by the Reading Coach in the ELA block will allow the team to identify areas of focus and improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

Utilize ELA Walkthrough tool to provide bi-weekly feedback to individual ELA teachers as well as communicate and highlight evidence-based practices that are impacting student achievement with the entire staff.

Person Responsible: Karen Seder (karen.seder1@charter.hcps.net)

Utilize research based core curriculum and intervention materials and monitor for consistent use.

Person Responsible: Karen Seder (karen.seder1@charter.hcps.net)

Encourage and monitor use of iReady practice in each grade level. Provide tracking and celebrations to encourage participation.

Person Responsible: Karen Seder (karen.seder1@charter.hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

The school has very low rates of discipline and will maintain positive supports to encourage that trend to continue.

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.

The mission of KCC schools is continually focused on students and places the home-school connection at the center of everything we do.

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

KCC Schools rely heavily on the support of the community as well as parent involvement. A required 20 hours of volunteer hours are required for each child that attends KCC. This allows us to constantly have a home/school connection. Additionally, we have a well-established fully functional Campus Parent Advisory Board that meets once a month to support and engage in the growth opportunities for KCC Schools.

Additionally, BoardMembers and community members are debriefed quarterly at our Board Meetings and Workshops with a platform to provide feedback.

We had over 75 businesses come in over the past year to support KCC by way of classroom demonstrations, discussions, the Great American Teach In, etc. Additionally, our students participate in field trips as it relates to concepts and curriculum.

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
Total:			\$0.00