

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lewis Elementary School



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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lewis Elementary School

6700 WHITEWAY DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Babanats

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lewis Elementary School

6700 WHITEWAY DR, Temple Terrace, FL 33617

[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)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

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 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.

Learn Here, Succeed Anywhere!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roland H. Lewis Elementary School will provide every student with a safe Learning Environment Where Individuals are Successful.

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
Fitzpatrick, Debra	Principal	Debra Fitzpatrick, Principal~Oversees school-wide progress Carmon Hinton, Assistant Principal~Oversees school-wide progress Kimberly Schisler,,SAC Chair~Conducts SAC meetings Kingsley Kelly, SAC Chair~Conducts SAC meetings Courtney Holder, ESE Specialist~Oversees ESE progress Megan Butler, Math Coach~Progress monitors math data Lisandra Molina, ELL Resource~Supports the learning of ELL students Emma Carson, Social Worker~Monitors attendance Amanda Leonard, Guidance Counselor~Supports school-wide behavior and mental health
Kelly, Kingsley	Teacher, K-12	
Schisler, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Melissa Babanats

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

670

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

4

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

2

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	89	104	108	110	99	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	28	36	35	43	18	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	15	39	40	32	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Course failure in Math	0	0	30	52	30	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	161
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	0	7	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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

Monday 8/30/2021

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	101	104	113	99	129	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	20	34	25	31	33	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	

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	101	104	113	99	129	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	20	34	25	31	33	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	13	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				48%	52%	57%	53%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	55%	58%	55%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	50%	53%	48%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	54%	63%	56%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	57%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	46%	51%	28%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				44%	50%	53%	67%	51%	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	40%	52%	-12%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	50%	55%	-5%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	45%	54%	-9%	62%	-17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	64%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Reading and Math for 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades
 Science: Baseline and Midyear for 5th

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26	45	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	37	47
	Students With Disabilities	28	41	48
	English Language Learners	7	21	36
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	38	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	30	48
	Students With Disabilities	27	40	56
	English Language Learners	2	28	42

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	41	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	36	47
	Students With Disabilities	32	42	50
	English Language Learners	23	32	37
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	33	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	29	40
	Students With Disabilities	21	35	49
	English Language Learners	9	23	16

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	65	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	62	69
	Students With Disabilities	47	59	68
	English Language Learners	29	27	39
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	23	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	22	34
	Students With Disabilities	18	23	38
	English Language Learners	9	11	18

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52	59	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	54	56
	Students With Disabilities	49	55	57
	English Language Learners	43	39	48
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21	32	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	27	40
	Students With Disabilities	26	38	43
	English Language Learners	8	18	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	58	63	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	60	63
	Students With Disabilities	60	70	72
	English Language Learners	39	34	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	31	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	27	40
	Students With Disabilities	32	40	52
	English Language Learners	5	12	16
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	41.5	33.6	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	38.5	30.89	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	55.1	62.39	N/A
	English Language Learners	11.6	7.02	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	19	28	29	22	20	6	31				
ELL	39	18		47	20		27				
BLK	38	41	38	27	22	12	20				
HSP	39	34	31	39	32		30				
MUL	29			37							
WHT	70	59		60	52		63				
FRL	39	37	29	34	26	11	31				
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	24	47	42	33	45	47	21				
ELL	39	41	31	55	69	45	10				
ASN	60	30		70	80						
BLK	39	49	32	35	45	33	29				
HSP	39	43	53	45	54	41	33				
MUL	57	50		48	43						
WHT	70	71	30	71	74		76				
FRL	39	47	35	39	49	41	30				
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	25	29	26	34	41	38	44				
ELL	29	45		44	37						
ASN	71			86							
BLK	35	36	37	38	45	21	35				
HSP	48	61	50	45	49	24	62				
MUL	57	57		57	57						
WHT	75	69		79	73		89				
FRL	43	47	45	44	48	28	52				

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	287
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	34
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	28
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	37
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	33

Multiracial Students	
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	57
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	32
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?

FSA data trends indicate low quartile gains are lowest performing in bottom quartile math and reading.

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

Lower quartile gains in math and in reading are the biggest concern.

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

There are gaps and regression due to the pandemic. Teachers will strategically plan for acceleration.

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

Bottom quartile math gains showed the biggest improvement in 2019. However, there was a big decline in this area in 2021.

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

Differentiation and a focus on student ownership were contributing factors to this improvement. We will streamline our mentoring program for lower quartile students to increase ownership and motivation.

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

Prior year data and baseline assessments will be used to identify areas of acceleration. Team planning and Professional Learning Communities will address best practices for acceleration.

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.

Teachers will receive training in acceleration versus remediation. Coaches cycles, PLC's, and job embedded professional development will serve as a support as well.

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

Continuous feedback based on walkthroughs will ensure sustainability. Professional development substitutes will provide further opportunities for peer observation, model classrooms, and job-embedded PD.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Area of Focus~involve all stakeholders in an effort to increase student engagement by planning quality, core instruction. Rationale~to increase overall proficiency and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: All subgroups will reach or maintain 41% or above proficiency.

Monitoring: Leadership team will attend planning sessions and PLC's. Frequent, specific, and timely feedback will be provided through walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Debra Fitzpatrick (debra.fitzpatrick@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase the culture of learning through purposeful professional development for strategic planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Purposeful professional development will lend itself to increased learning gains and proficiency in all subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conducting grade-level standards-based planning sessions
2. Regularly scheduled PLC meetings
3. Vertical planning sessions to address spiraling in gaps
4. Purposeful differentiated instruction
5. Culturally responsive training & management courses
6. Coaching cycles and feedback sessions
7. Frequent walkthrough feedback with an emphasis on instructional priorities
8. Inclusion model with increase the success of SWD students and black subgroup will be closely monitor on data tracker.

Person Responsible Debra Fitzpatrick (debra.fitzpatrick@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: There was a decline in proficiency and gains according to the FSA in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency, ELA gains, and ELA bottom quartile gains will increase 10 percentage points in each category on the FSA.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored by professional learning communities, data chats, planning sessions, and through walkthroughs with frequent feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Debra Fitzpatrick (debra.fitzpatrick@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Increase the culture of learning through purposeful professional development for strategic planning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Purposeful professional development and frequent feedback will lend themselves to increased learning gains and proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conducting grade-level standards-based planning sessions
2. Regularly scheduled PLC meetings
3. Vertical planning sessions to address spiraling in gaps
4. Purposeful differentiated instruction
5. Culturally responsive training & management courses
6. Coaching cycles and feedback sessions
7. Frequent walkthrough feedback with an emphasis on instructional priorities

Person Responsible Debra Fitzpatrick (debra.fitzpatrick@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

Create an environment where students' social and emotional learning needs are met to ensure student well-being and academic gains for all. Although the "Violent Incidents" category is in the low range, it has the most frequency in comparison with other areas. We will continue to implement PBIS strategies, monitor mental health data, and conduct mentor sessions along behavior triage for tier three behaviors.

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.

School improvement will be enhanced by hosting parent information nights with an academic focus. We will invite parent comments and questions on all invitations. Communication will be enhanced by sharing invitations and information through different platforms.

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, and Guidance Counselor along with behavior committee of teachers will take the lead in overseeing systems and positive incentives.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00