Fox Hollow Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

https://fhes.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Pitkoff

Start Date for this Principal: 5/18/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	90%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	YEAR 1
Support Tier	IMPLEMENTING
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Fox Hollow Elementary School

8309 FOX HOLLOW DR, Port Richey, FL 34668

https://fhes.pasco.k12.fl.us

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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	87%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Owl" Be Your Champion!

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kinzie, Karyn	Principal	
Grubbs, Daniell	Assistant Principal	
Heredia, Maria	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade PLC Facilitator
Jett, Maureen	Teacher, K-12	Special Area PLC Facilitator
Cordt, Vanessa	Instructional Coach	As a Learning Design Coach, Vanessa supports Math instruction and coaches best practices.
Montano, Marissa	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade PLC Facilitator
Remail, Brittney	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade PLC Faclitator
Robbins, Renee	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade PLC Co-Faclitator
Rosario, Erica	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade PLC Co-Facilitator
Shipe, Sherri	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten PLC Faclitator
Yates, Rochelle	Teacher, ESE	ESE PLC Faclitator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 5/18/2016, Jessica Pitkoff

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
699

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
17

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	96	100	81	95	120	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	26	38	19	35	41	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	182
One or more suspensions	6	10	6	17	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failures ELA or Math	6	10	23	9	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1s on 2019 ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	24	34	20	24	18	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Sunday 8/1/2021

2020-21 - 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	77	104	73	83	110	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	522
Attendance below 90 percent	15	30	14	18	21	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				44%	58%	57%	40%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	56%	58%	57%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				48%	54%	53%	64%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				41%	60%	63%	42%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	61%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	50%	51%	43%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				47%	53%	53%	35%	56%	55%

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	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	59%	-14%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	55%	-20%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	37%	59%	-22%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	62%	-18%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	34%	57%	-23%	60%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

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	5	8		9	7		8				
ELL	17			9							
BLK	14			10							
HSP	20	22		13	11		11				
MUL	22			22							
WHT	30	24		27	36		28				
FRL	25	33	46	21	28	9	21				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	35	36	23	45	38	31				
ELL											
BLK	17	10		27							
HSP	43	43		32	54	38	32				
MUL	23			45							
WHT	48	49	71	45	53	31	55				
FRL	41	40	47	38	53	42	42				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	39	41	12	32	20					
BLK	18	64		14	60						
HSP	41	55	64	31	35	20	36				
MUL	36			36							
WHT	42	57	57	52	63	40	36				
FRL	36	57	65	36	54	44	29				

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	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	13
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	23

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	12
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	18
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	22
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	29
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Significant ELA deficits, specifically in Learning Gains and Lowest Quartile, as indicated by Low 300 status.

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

All areas are in need of improvement, but the most significant area is ELA based on NWEA MAP data, IRLA data and 2019 FSA data.

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

Before COVID, our students were making a slow and steady increase in ELA based on our teachers' strong focus on ELA Tier 1 instruction and interventions. However, the impact of COVID has resulted in a significant decline in reading mastery due to absences, illness, distance learning (Spring 2020) and mySchool Online (20-21) due to lack of continued exposure.

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

Our Science data showed the most improvement on the 2019 state assessment. In 2018, 35% of our 5th grade students were proficient. In 2019, we increased to 47%. However, based off progress monitoring for the 2019-2020 and the 2020-2021 school years, our NWEA MAP data and End of Unit District Assessments indicate a sharp decline in Science proficiency based on lack of exposure due to COVID among other reasons.

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

Contributing factors that lead to the increase of Science scores in 2019 include the use of a Science Coach (purchased from SIG-4), as well as guided planning time and coaching support. We also created an extended hands-on Science block once a week to ensure that teachers were designing hands-on, 5E lessons.

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

In order to accelerate learning, a continued focus on Science instruction in all grade levels is necessary despite the heavy focus on ELA with the new BEST standards.

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.

The professional development necessary to accelerate learning include a focus on Core Action 2 and Core Action 3, as well as the implementation of collaborative structures, so students remain engaged in the lesson and are held accountable for their learning.

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

Additional services/supports needed to sustain improvement include continued learning around Core Action 2 and Core Action 3 with modeling, observations and feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	High Impact Instruction: All student learning experiences match the rigor of the standards
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, using our Core Action Walkthrough Tool, 60% of teachers will show evidence that they are planning, delivering, assessing and monitoring standards-based instruction matched to the rigor of the standards, with a focus on Core Action 2 and 3.
Monitoring:	High Impact Instruction will be monitored by monthly rigor walkthroughs using the Instructional Practice Guides (IPGs).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC uninterrupted time and space for each grade level Creation of Essential Standards for each grade level PLCs agree upon/create Common Formative Assessments Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures PD and implementation Conscious Discipline PD and Implementation
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To keep up with our technologically inclined and video game obsessed students, it is critical to create fun, engaging and relatable learning opportunities for students in order to keep them focused on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Despite a significant increase in our Gallup Student Engagement data from 53% to 65% and Student Hope data from 25% to 46%, our Gallup Staff Engagement data decreased from 40% to 33%.
Measurable Outcome:	Collaborative Culture: By December 2021, our overall employee engagement percentage will increase from 33% (in 2020) of employees engaged to 40% of our employees engaged based on our Gallup Employee Engagement survey. The percentage of Student Hope will increase from 46% (in 2020) to 50% and Student Engagement will increase from 65% (in 2020) to 68% on the Gallup Student survey
Monitoring:	We will conduct the Gallup Survey for staff and students in October 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: Continue Conscious Discipline learning and implementation CD Coaching by Amy Zolessi: 9/21, 10/26, 1/25, 2/15, 3/8, 4/26 Six 1-Hour CDAT Sessions with Amy Zolessi: 7/12, 8/31, 11/2, 1/4, 3/1, 5/3 Two 1-Hour Admin Coaching with Amy Zolessi: 10/12, 2/1 Two 1-Hour Regulator Support with Amy Zolessi: 11/30, 4/5 2-Day Summer PD, 7/11 & 12 Begin The 7 Powers Conscious Discipline e-Course Student Celebration Station: Positive Office Referrals, Crew Members of the Week, Color Team Points/Incentives Staff Crew Member of the Week Purchase of Behavior Specialist and full-time Social Worker to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior supports and social skills
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Especially in this time of our nation's crises, it is essential to focus on student and staff recognition and social emotional wellbeing.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using a collection of samples, we met 5 out of 8 indicators on the Eight Quality Characteristics of Tiered Interventions and Action Plans.
Measurable Outcome:	Data Driven Decisions: By May 2022, PLCs will create, implement and monitor instruction in Reading and Mathematics to include Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions supports, which will increase our data, both proficiency and learning gains, by at least 3%.
Monitoring:	We will use the Eight Quality Characteristics of Tiered Interventions and Action Plans rubric to assess our grade level action plans to ensure high quality interventions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karyn Kinzie (kkinzie@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: • Modified Action Plan Document to meet the Eight Quality Characteristics of Tiered Interventions and Action Plans rubric • Continue monthly SIT meetings to monitor Lowest 35% • Academic Tutors to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention • Weekly Regulator Team Meetings • Weekly Intervention Team Meetings • Weekly Coaching Meetings
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Included in these strategies are best practices to ensure alignment of School Leadership Team (SLT), Student Intervention Team and Professional Learning Communities, as well as areas of focus relative to our district's goals.
Action Steps to Implement	

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our school is participating in a SIPPS Study with first and second grade students in need of Tier 3 interventions.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome will be the student data, as a result of Tier 3 instruction using the SIPPS Program.
Monitoring:	We will use DIBELS from the fall and winter to measure growth. Specifically, we will use the Non-sense Word Fluency & Oral Reading Fluency section of DIBELS during the fall administration for the students receiving SIPPS as Tier 3 intervention.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Daniell Grubbs (dgrubbs@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will implement the SIPPS Intervention Program to first and second grade students in need of Tier 3 intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As a result of significant gaps in learning, likely due to COVID, a large number of our first and second grade students are in needs of Tier 3 instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Fox Hollow is ranked 1,297 out of 1,395 elementary schools state-wide. We have a significant number of suspensions due to a population of extremely aggressive students. Despite our efforts, staff turnover and teachers that lack high-quality strategies, including composure, impact student discipline data. Working closely with our Conscious Discipline Coach, we have designed an Active Calming Room, the School Safe Place, where students will be guided through the 5-Steps to Self-Regulation after working through active calming strategies. We are hopeful that implementation of these strategies will result in students displaying safer behavior and returning to calm quicker, as we work to rewire their brain.

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.

Staff and families recognize staff for Crew Member of the Week. Teachers recognize students as Crew Members of the Week (students who follow our school expectations), as well as all staff have opportunities to recognize students by awarding them with a Positive Office Referral. We also collect weekly Color Team points by grade level. Teachers recognize greatness in other classes/grade levels and award points. The grade level with the most points at the end of the week spins the wheel of prizes. Within their own classrooms, teachers also build a positive school culture and environment by recognizing students for following expectations.

We also have a Safekeeper (Mentor) Program where students in need of a safe person and positive relationship are paired with a mentor to help them fulfill this very important need.

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

All stakeholders take part in promoting a positive school culture and environment.