**Hardee County Schools** 

# Zolfo Springs Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

# **Zolfo Springs Elementary School**

3215 SCHOOL HOUSE RD, Zolfo Springs, FL 33890

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/zolfo\_springs/index.htm

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

## **Demographics**

Principal: Suzanne Stagg E

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)	100%
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. F	or more information, click here.

## **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

## **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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Last Modified: 5/5/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 19

## **Zolfo Springs Elementary School**

3215 SCHOOL HOUSE RD, Zolfo Springs, FL 33890

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/zolfo\_springs/index.htm

### **School Demographics**

School Type and Gi (per MSID		2020-21 Title I Schoo	l Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	School	Yes		96%
Primary Servio (per MSID		Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		63%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		В	В	Α

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

Achieving excellence in education in a safe, positive learning environment.

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

Building learning partnerships with home, school, and community to ensure personal and academic excellence.

## 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
Stagg, Suzanne	Principal	
LaJeunesse, Leigh	Assistant Principal	
Coleman, Angella	Instructional Coach	
Gicker, Kari	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Teacher
Moreau, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Teacher
Thomas, Ketus	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Teacher
Thornton, Blaire	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Teacher
Woods, Amy	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Bryant, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Lor, Khao Hlee	Teacher, K-12	
Wood, April	Teacher, K-12	

## **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Suzanne Stagg E

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.

6

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.

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

589

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

9

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

8

**Demographic Data** 

## **Early Warning Systems**

## 2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	107	109	93	95	95	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	6	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	11	10	5	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	10	10	5	11	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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	8	12	12	14	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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

Indicator	Grade Level														
mulcator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal	
Students with two or more indicators	2	4	5	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	

## The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator		Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total		
Retained Students: Current Year	11	10	2	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37		
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		

## Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/7/2021

## 2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator				Total										
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	104	96	78	89	85	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	9	9	5	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	5	6	8	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Indicator						Gr	ade	e Le	vel					Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	4	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator					(	3ra	de	Lev	/el					Total
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	20	10	3	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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													
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	104	96	78	89	85	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	9	9	5	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	5	6	8	9	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total					
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	4	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total			
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	20	10	3	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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 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 Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				56%	56%	57%	55%	54%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	60%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	52%	53%	50%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	71%	63%	73%	68%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	70%	62%	81%	63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74%	61%	51%	81%	55%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	43%	53%	43%	47%	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	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
Cohort Com	nparison					
04	2021					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Com	nparison	-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Cohort Com	nparison	-56%			•	

			MATH	ł		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	69%	-2%	62%	5%
Cohort Co	mparison					
04	2021					
	2019	71%	73%	-2%	64%	7%
Cohort Co	mparison	-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	77%	62%	15%	60%	17%
Cohort Co	mparison	-71%				

			SCIEN	CE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	37%	42%	-5%	53%	-16%
Cohort Com	nparison					

## **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

1st/2nd-Star, i-Ready 3rd/4th/5th-Star, i-Ready, FSA

		Grade 1		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21	51	68
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	15	43	62
	Students With Disabilities	0	43	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7	25	51
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	6	20	40
	Students With Disabilities	0	15	16
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
		Grade 2		
		Grade 2		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 43	Spring 59
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities	Fall 19	43	59
	Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With	Fall 19 20	43 39	59 61
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language	Fall 19 20 0	43 39 25	59 61 53
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students	Fall 19 20 0	43 39 25 0	59 61 53 100
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall  19 20 0 0 Fall	43 39 25 0 Winter	59 61 53 100 Spring
Arts	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically	Fall 19 20 0 0 Fall 10	43 39 25 0 Winter 37	59 61 53 100 Spring 63

		Grade 3		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	70	78
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	36	59	74
	Students With Disabilities	27	54	58
	English Language Learners	0	0	67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14	46	75
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	9	44	72
	Students With Disabilities	9	36	41
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
		Grade 4		
	Number/% Proficiency	<b>Grade 4</b> Fall	Winter	Spring
	Proficiency All Students		Winter 49	Spring 55
English Language Arts	Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall		
	Proficiency  All Students  Economically  Disadvantaged  Students With  Disabilities	Fall 29	49	55
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners	<b>Fall</b> 29 9	49 44	55 72
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency	Fall 29 9 5 0 Fall	49 44 10 0 Winter	55 72 25 100 Spring
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students	Fall 29 9 5	49 44 10 0	55 72 25 100
	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged	Fall 29 9 5 0 Fall	49 44 10 0 Winter	55 72 25 100 Spring
Arts	Proficiency  All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners  Number/% Proficiency  All Students Economically	Fall 29 9 5 0 Fall 24	49 44 10 0 Winter 52	55 72 25 100 Spring 73

		Grade 5		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	35	44
English Language Arts	Economically Disadvantaged	18	32	35
	Students With Disabilities	22	29	37
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	41	61
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged	19	36	64
	Students With Disabilities	19	38	52
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

## Subgroup Data Review

		2021	SCHOO	OL GRAD	E COMF	PONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	37	40		58	75		26				
ELL	41	33		63	55		20				
HSP	56	52	69	74	71	69	26				
WHT	61	40		71	50		39				
FRL	53	44	57	71	64	73	27				
		2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SU	JBGRO	UPS		
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	42	40	57	85	88	21				
ELL	38	46	50	60	69	54	24				
HSP	52	49	47	69	75	74	32				
WHT	63	61	50	77	78	73	53				
FRL	50	47	42	68	71	69	37				

	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	28	42	42	44	58	53	36				
ELL	18	50		41	67						
HSP	53	63	59	73	79	81	37				
WHT	59	55	40	73	84	80	50				
FRL	52	59	54	71	82	85	39				

## **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	58
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	52
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	55
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?

All areas experienced growth between Fall to Spring assessments. The SWD and ELL sub groups have an achievement gap between non sub groups in all grades in ELA and Math.

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

Based on progress monitoring data and FSA data, ZSE's 4th and 5th grade ELA are the weakest area.

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

When looking at FSA data, the majority of students who scored a level 1 or 2 on FSA ELA were the weakest in Implementing Depth of Knowledge. Based on this data ZSE will be implementing Depth of Knowledge training and classroom resources for all teachers.

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

All grades and sub groups showed the most growth in math as compared to ELA.

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

ZSE continues to use Reflex math to supplement it's core curriculum.

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

ZSE now has access to i-Ready ELA, Writing, and Math teacher tool boxes. These tool boxes give teachers resources needed to carry out small group instruction and differentiate accelerated learning.

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.

I Ready and DOK training will be available for all teachers. Teachers will have i-Ready training from an outside trainer and continued support from the school's curriculum coach and district data coach. DOK training will be provided by the schools curriculum coach.

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

Best Standards training will be provided for all teachers. Teachers will be monitored to insure Best Standards are being taught with fidelity. Ongoing i-Ready training will also continue.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

#### **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Area of Based of Scoring

Description and

Based on FSA data for 3rd, 4th, and 5th, grade, one area of weakness with students scoring a level 1 or 2 is their ability to answer higher order questioning. Our lowest scoring area school wide was Integration of Knowledge and Ideas. Based on this data we will be implementing Depth of Knowledge (DOK) training and providing classroom resources for all

Rationale: teachers. DOK will also be imbedded in all Title One after school programs.

Measurable Outcome:

ZSE would like to see 15% of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on FSA increase one

achievement level.

**Monitoring:** 

School administration and curriculum coach will monitor and assist teachers with DOK. i-

Ready data will also be used to monitor.

Person responsible

for

Suzanne Stagg (sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy:

The strategy that will be used is Depth of Knowledge. Teachers will be trained and

resources will be provided.

Rationale

for Evidencebased The rationale for using this strategy is to increase proficiency in the area of implementing depth of knowledge. Teachers will be provided training and resources for DOK. This strategy was selected based on data and teacher observation. Use of DOK with fidelity will add rigor to classroom instruction.

Strategy:

## **Action Steps to Implement**

1. All teachers will receive training and resources for Depth of Knowledge training.

Person Responsible

Angella Coleman (acoleman@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Fidelity of DOK will be monitored by school administration and coach.

Person Responsible

Suzanne Stagg (sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us)

3. Benchmark data will be reviewed mid year and end of year.

Person

Responsible

Suzanne Stagg (sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us)

## **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Zolfo Springs Elementary was not listed on the SafeschoolsforAlex.org website. ZSE has very few discipline issues, ZSE has a positive behavior system in place. During the 2021-22 school year, ZSE will focus on bullying prevention. ZSE will provide lessons regarding bullying each 9 weeks during activity rotation. The school counselor and social worker will hold small group sessions with selected students weekly. Discipline data will be reviewed and monitored weekly. Zolfo Springs Elementary also has a Threat Assessment team that meets at least once per month.

## 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.

ZSE provides an open house so students have the opportunity to meet their teachers prior to the start of the school year. A student/parent/teacher conference is held for each student during the first six weeks of school. During this conference the expectations and roles of each party are reviewed and the school compact is signed. Data chats are held quarterly between parents, students, and teachers to communicate positive progress and areas of need. Specific dates are set aside for evening conferences to accommodate working parents. Daily correspondence through a planner or binder goes home to be signed by parents and students. Weekly reports go home from classroom teachers discussing current curriculum, homework, and classroom activities. Many teachers have incorporated Class Dojo into their daily correspondence with students and parents. Class Dojo connects teachers with students and parents to build classroom communities. Remind texting correspondence to parents allows ZSE to send messages regarding upcoming events, community events, and school wide messages. ZSE also shares school news and events on the schools Facebook page. A newsletter goes home to parents from school monthly including grade level accomplishments, progress on the school improvement plan, and opportunities to get involved as a parent. An automated phone message system, Edulink, is used to inform parents of upcoming school events or absence of their child. ZSE also solicits feedback from parents on surveys regarding Title 1 and parent involvement yearly. Parents may contact teachers or administrators with questions. A Title 1 orientation is held in the first month of school to review student achievement data, share Title 1 requirements, and educate parents on their rights to participate in school activities. Bi-monthly parent nights are held to provide valuable information regarding the schools curriculum and exciting learning activities to do at home.

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

ZSE stakeholders include parents, students, community members, teachers and staff, school administrators, district staff and school board members. Parents roles are to attend parent conferences, school events, communicate regularly with their child's teacher and be a positive advocate for their child. Parents take on the role of making sure their students attend school, get a good night's rest, and complete homework assignments. Parents are encouraged to join school committees such as the school advisory council, PTO, attend parent nights, and Title I events to have input in school decisions. Students are expected to attend class, be prepared, complete assignments, and take care of school property. Community members and leaders play a vital role in the culture of a school by supporting school programs monetarily and as volunteers. Teachers and school staff are expected to possess the professional knowledge to lead students in instruction. Teachers and school staff also serve as mentors and supervisors of students during the school day and after school activities. District staff serve schools by offering support with programs, curriculum, and district wide initiatives. The school boards role is fulfill the districts vision and make the best decisions for all students.

## 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