

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Chiaramonte 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cassandra Smallen

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2021

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 (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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	19

Chiaramonte Elementary School

6001 S HIMES AVE, Tampa, FL 33611

[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	73%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

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.

Prepare students to become successful, productive, and responsible adults.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide an educational foundation that will encourage lifelong learning.

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
Opila, Daniel	Principal	Facilitate Team Meeting. Generate Agenda Items. Problem Solve
Trevino, Samantha	SAC Member	SAC Chair
Smallen, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	Collect School Data, Develop Professional Development for Instructional Practices
Torres, Kimberly	School Counselor	Collect Behavioral Data, Monitor Progress of students with behaviors, develop programs for Mental Health
Bostwick, Renee	Other	Update ESE Procedures, Systems, and Processes. Collect data for ESE, Collaborate with Title 1 on Parent Involvement

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/22/2021, Cassandra Smallen

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

330

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

5

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

7

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	56	52	49	67	56	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	315
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	12	10	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	13	17	20	23	15	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in Math	16	13	10	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	4	4	11	11	5	0	0	0	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	11	9	13	10	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	55	59	69	60	39	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	5	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	10	19	22	29	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	6	16	7	16	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	3	3	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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	55	59	69	60	39	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	334
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	5	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	10	19	22	29	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in Math	6	16	7	16	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	3	3	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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				57%	52%	57%	57%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	55%	58%	58%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	50%	53%	32%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	54%	63%	59%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	57%	62%	49%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	46%	51%	37%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	50%	53%	53%	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	57%	52%	5%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	55%	8%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	60%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
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

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34%	32%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	2	1	2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31%	45%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	3	1	0
	English Language Learners	0	1	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24%	18%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	1	1
	Students With Disabilities	3	2	1
	English Language Learners	2	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13%	11%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	1	0
	Students With Disabilities	1	1	0
	English Language Learners	1	1	0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34%	34%	50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	1
	Students With Disabilities	1	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	1	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15%	11%	25%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	1	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46%	26%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	1	1
	Students With Disabilities	5	3	1
	English Language Learners	3	2	1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20%	10%	38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	1	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2	1	0
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22%	14%	17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	2	1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	1
	English Language Learners	2	1	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17%	6%	12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	2	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			48%
	Economically Disadvantaged			8
	Students With Disabilities			5
	English Language Learners			1

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	22	54		39	38		55				
ELL	50			50							
BLK	36			40							
HSP	34			50							
MUL	50			60							
WHT	56	77		60	69		55				
FRL	44	64		51	38		46				
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	39	39	54	51	48	27	27				
ELL	30										
BLK	59	50		54	50		30				
HSP	59	55	50	57	51	45	52				
MUL	56	31		61	46						
WHT	58	58	60	67	59		48				
FRL	55	50	44	55	50	31	43				
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	54	36	33	42	50	54				
ELL	18	50		18	30						
BLK	47	46		47	38	20	20				
HSP	52	58	40	55	56	50	45				
MUL	68	61		68	39		73				
WHT	60	68		66	51		69				
FRL	52	55	33	53	50	36	44				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	298

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	47
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	38
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	42
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	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	63
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?

4th Grade Proficiency scores were lower (ELA 42%-Math 46%) 5th Grade was higher (ELA 52%-Math 63%) AGP students excelled. ESE Students struggled.

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

The ELA Proficiency (57 down to 48%) and the Learning Gains in Math (53 to 42%) both dropped 9% from 2019

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

Lack of effective Differentiation strategies could have led to these low scores as well as inconsistent instruction throughout the school year due to COVID

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

ELA Learning Gains improved 12%

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

Small group targeted instruction

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

Improved instructional practices, Introducing Acceleration into Planning and Instruction, Effective Data Analysis, Effective small group instruction based on individual needs, progress monitoring and adjusting instruction when needed

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.

Classroom Management, Instructional framework and Curriculum, Schoolwide Behavior Training, Collaborative Planning

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

Scheduled Collaborative Data Planning sessions to make decisions on acceleration and Remediation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decrease in Learning Gains in Math and a decrease in Proficiency Levels in ELA and Math. Low bottom Quartile scores in 2019, especially in Math
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021-22, we will increase our ELA Bottom Quartile from 46% (2019) to 70%, increase our Math bottom Quartile from 32% (2019) to 70%, Increase our Learning Gains in ELA from 63% to 70% and in Math from 42% to 70%.
Monitoring:	Bi-Weekly Collaborative Data Planning Meeting, Quarterly Report Card Conferences
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Driven Decsion Making
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Making specific decisions based on individual students will allow for more effective Planning and Preparation of Instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Progress monitoring will occur bi-weekly during Collaborative Planning Sessions. All students will be monitored for progress, but a specific focus will be used on our Bottom Quartile

Person Responsible	Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)
---------------------------	--

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Rationale: In 2020-21, 46% of our 4th grade students scored a Level 3 or higher on the FSA ELA. Teachers will plan for differentiation and scaffolding to support their diverse learners with grade-level content and acceleration of unfinished learning (Instructional Frameworks).
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020-21, 46% of students in 4th Grade demonstrated Proficiency (Level 3+) on the ELA FSA. In 2021-22, 60% of 5th Grade students will demonstrate a Proficiency on the Spring ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	Bi-Weekly Collaborative Data Analysis meetings will be held with Administration and the Reading Resource Teacher on i-Ready, ELA PMA's, Unit Assessments, and Classroom Quizzes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a Weekly Common Planning Schedule and Protocol to include opportunities for teacher clarity around learning targets and tasks that are aligned to the rigor of the standard including specific planning for ELA students. Teachers will meet with our Reading Resource Teacher weekly to develop best practices for implementation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In 2020-21, 46% of students in 4th Grade demonstrated Proficiency (Level 3+) on the ELA FSA. The improvement strategy will increase opportunities for teachers to develop specific instructional strategies/resources resulting in improved student academic performance in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will attend common planning sessions with the Reading Resource Teacher weekly.

Person Responsible Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

2. Collaborative Data Planning will be held bi-weekly with administration and the Reading Resource Teacher to analyze student progress.

Person Responsible Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@hcps.net)

3. Classroom Walk-Throughs will focus on implementation of Planning Development, Resources for learning activities, and Instructional Best Practices.

Person Responsible Cassandra Smallen (cassandra.smallen@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.

Chiaramonte's Incident Rate for Discipline is far below the State average of 2.5 per 100 Students. our rate is 0.4 per 100 students.

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.

- Collabarative Decision Making
- Re-institute Steering Committee
- Build stronger PTA, SAC, and Parent Involvement
- Include Stakeholders in SIP, Crisis Management Plan, new Mission/Vision development
- Monthly Student and Staff Incentives for Attendance
- Monthly Student and Staff Recognition Celebrations
- Student and Staff "Caught being Good" program
- Parent "Caught Being Good" program
- Institute new PBIS system

Inclusion in these areas will ensure all stakeholder voices are included to build a trusting and respectful climate.

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

Dan Opila-Facilitating Leadership Team, Collaborative Planning sessions, Mission/Vision, SIP, PBIS
 Cassandra Smallen-Facilitating Collaborative Planning Sessions, creating Staff Incentives, PBIS
 Jody Orlando - Attendance Incentives
 Kim Torres - Behavior, Citizenship, Caught being Good Incentives
 Renee Bostwick - Parent Involvement activities
 Samantha Trevino - SAC Chairperson and SIP
 Rachel Wheeler - PTA President

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00