

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Citrus Park 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

Citrus Park Elementary School

7700 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33625

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Christopher Fonteyn

Start Date for this Principal: 9/18/2015

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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

Citrus Park Elementary School

7700 GUNN HWY, Tampa, FL 33625

[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	No	52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will make our vision a reality by providing a school culture and community of SOAR:

Be Safe
Be Organized and Prepared
Be An Active Learner
Be Respectful

Provide the school's vision statement.

Citrus Park Elementary will soar as the district's leader in developing successful students.

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
Fonteyn, Chris	Principal	Make sure the SIP is implemented and follow up on responsibilities.
Isajar, Jackie	Assistant Principal	Serve as the administrative liaison to build and ensure the plan is in place and is followed or adapted.
Morris, Ali	Teacher, ESE	SAC Chair, set and run meetings, build agenda and connect all members.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 9/18/2015, Christopher Fonteyn

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.*

8

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

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

600

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

1

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

3

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	85	88	77	80	89	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	11	12	7	12	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	2	4	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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

Friday 5/28/2021

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	85	88	77	80	89	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	9	20	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	9	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	85	88	77	80	89	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	9	20	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	9	2	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				63%	52%	57%	70%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	55%	58%	70%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	50%	53%	60%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	54%	63%	70%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	57%	62%	76%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	46%	51%	58%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				56%	50%	53%	74%	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	63%	52%	11%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	55%	16%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	51%	2%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1st :i-Ready
 2nd: i-Ready
 3rd: i-Ready
 4th: i-Ready
 5th:i-Ready
 5th Science District Science Assement

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	30	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	30	59
	Students With Disabilities	14	20	36
	English Language Learners	3	22	50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	21	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	16	32
	Students With Disabilities	5	15	14
	English Language Learners	9	9	28

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28	41	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	33	50
	Students With Disabilities	13	26	30
	English Language Learners	24	38	62
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16	22	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	19	35
	Students With Disabilities	14	15	21
	English Language Learners	12	15	35
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	30	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	23	33
	Students With Disabilities	7	17	22
	English Language Learners	0	6	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3	8	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	4	2
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	11
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	32	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	23	34
	Students With Disabilities	4	10	17
	English Language Learners	0	6	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4	11	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	3	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	4	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	13
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	8	22	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	19	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	0
	English Language Learners	0	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8	16	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	13	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	58	72	
	Economically Disadvantaged	49	68	
	Students With Disabilities	36	47	
	English Language Learners	20	40	

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	40	65		44	59	50	55				
ELL	56	46		58	54		46				
ASN	75			80							
BLK	69			63							
HSP	54	50	27	52	53	45	52				
MUL	64			71							
WHT	69	76		63	67		68				
FRL	59	53	33	59	61	50	55				
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	43	60	48	42	51	44	44				
ELL	58	62		72	59		47				
ASN	87	77		93	85						
BLK	41	35		43	47		40				
HSP	58	63	59	64	63	42	50				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	74	69	58	81	65		69				
FRL	55	57	47	64	63	43	52				
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	50	46	31	53	60	47	55				
ELL	59	68	58	75	80						
ASN	81			81							
BLK	65	83		52	54						
HSP	62	68	61	68	80	61	71				
MUL	60	30		53	70						
WHT	81	75		78	77	58	84				
FRL	65	69	52	66	74	53	65				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	53
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	68
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
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	53
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?

Students struggle in mathematics compared to ELA. Our ELL and ESE students lag behind their peers in achievement levels. Achievement drops off between primary and intermediate on comparative data.

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

ELL and ESE students lag behind their same grade peers in all areas. Students struggle to make achievement targets and their growth lags behind their typical peers. Lowest quartile fails to meet the growth of the other students.

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

The FSA data is over two years old and so is viewed with suspect. Monitoring data shows that students who were remote learners struggled significantly more than brick and mortar students. Those that were brought back to brick and mortar improved slightly from winter to spring scores but lost half

a year of instruction. Close monitoring of students through MTSS would enable targeted instruction in areas of loss.

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

Students with disabilities showed at 14 point gain in ELA growth and the SWD lowest quartile grew by 17 points.

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

ESE teachers met in their own PLC to target the needs of their students. They also implemented Phonics First instruction.

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

The MTSS process needs to be implemented with fidelity and small group instructions, targeting specific needs, needs to continue. Many students have lost valuable time due to Covid-19, both in quarantine and remote learning. The stress of the pandemic may also be a contributing factor.

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 MTSS process will be more structured and the school year will kick off with a training in MTSS and progress monitoring. SEL instruction will be taught and the school is partnering with Frameworks to build capacity with teachers and staff.

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

We will be starting with our MTSS training and building in structured and calendared meetings in which we utilize our additional resources to meet the needs of all our students (volunteers, TTDs, ELP tutors etc.).

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus	
Focus Description and Rationale:	Looking at the data achievement and growth differences between the ELL, ESE subgroups as well as the students who were distance learning we need to focus on the MTSS process to target specific needs to make up for the gaps in student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	The progress monitoring data shows that the ELL and ESE subgroups lag behind their same age peers in our formative testing data. With the structured use of the MTSS process we hope to target learning needs and close the gap between the subgroups and same age peers between Fall, Winter, and spring formative assessments to include but not exclusive of: i-Ready, Achieve 3000 level sets, math monthlies, SIPP's Mastery Tests.
Monitoring:	Post Formative Assessment, PLC's will review student data make adjustments to instruction and discuss findings with the ILT to see school wide trends.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The school will be using the 4-Step Problem Solving Process to track student progression to see if the interventions being used are working. If not, modify instruction and assess again.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In review of the data we have found that the school is very good at looking at data and seeing strengths and weaknesses, however... The follow up assessment to see if the interventions are working often is left to the formative assessments given Fall, Winter, and Spring, not on a more regular basis.

Action Steps to Implement

Every six weeks grade levels will meet with the school leadership team to go over students and the plans, interventions, monitoring tools, and progress of tier III students. Meetings will be calendared out throughout the year. District personnel will be contacted to assist when needed.

Person Responsible Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The pandemic (Covid-19) has had a large impact on the culture of the school. Large gatherings did not happen and often students felt isolated from their peers (especially if they were learning remotely). Maslow's Hierarchy of Learning begins with the students' basic needs being met, including emotional needs. With 4 units of Access students, and 2 Behavior Supports units, there is a need for teaching social emotional skills and how to adapt to life situations. The Panorama survey revealed that the students in this school scored themselves below the district average and dropped over the course of the year.
Measurable Outcome:	When students take the Panorama survey their percent favorable will increase over the course of the year.
Monitoring:	Utilizing class meetings and through PLC's to monitor students' well being.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marcy White (marcy.white@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will be using Conscious Discipline as well as CBS (through Frameworks Coaching).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Both Conscious Discipline and CBS teach students how to self regulate as well as set up the framework for teaching behavioral skills.

Action Steps to Implement

The principal will schedule trainings throughout the year to educate the staff on SEL Practices. This will be done through Frameworks.

10/13/21 Collaborative Learning Communities (Mindfulness Jars)

10/20/21 Educator Wellness

11/17/21 Classroom Discussion as an SEL Tool

12/9/21 Integrating SEL and Classroom Management

1/19/22 CBS Booster

2/16/22 Integrating SEL and Academic Instruction

3/2/22 Collaborative Learning Communities (Emotional Wheel)

Person Responsible Chris Fonteyn (kit.fonteyn@hcps.net)

A Frameworks coach will work with teachers to ensure practices are being utilized in the best emotional support of students.

Person Responsible Marcy White (marcy.white@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.

We had a total of 3 in-school suspensions, 2 out-of-school suspensions and 1 parent pick up in 2021-2022. Our belief is that students can't learn if they are not in class. We handle the situation and then get them back in class. We utilize Conscious Discipline and implement SEL in our school.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school builds a positive school culture by starting with teaching Conscious Discipline to both teachers and students with a belief that students need to be taught how to behave and how to adapt when their world is interrupted. We have been fortunate enough to be sponsored to have Frameworks come to our school to train and coach our teachers on SEL. Students are rewarded with Principal luncheons and we are fortunate to have a positive PTA.

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

The student services team keeps the pulse on the families and the students. They often bring students or families in need up to the leadership team.

Leadership team works together to build capacity within the school to meet all the demanding needs of students and families.

The CD/PBIS team takes a look at behavior trends and build the structure that students need to be behaviorally and emotionally successful.

The PTA is critical in building the bridge between families and staff. Often providing support to help students and teachers get what they need to be successful.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00