

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Lomax Magnet 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	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Jacobsen Capps

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 KG-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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (47%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Lomax Magnet Elementary School

4207 N 26TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>87%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>99%</p>

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.

Lomax will build a community of active thinking and learning citizens through exploration, enrichment, electives and expeditions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Lomax community will develop the individual talents and strengths of each child.

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
Jacobsen Capps, Sarah	Principal	Principal
Dickens, Regina	Teacher, ESE	SAC Chair
Baez, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	member
Barr, Katrina	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Sarah Jacobsen Capps

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

18

Total number of students enrolled at the school

343

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

7

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

6

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	40	47	49	54	49	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	12	15	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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

Thursday 9/23/2021

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	59	54	568	58	77	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	888
Attendance below 90 percent	12	10	13	9	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	0	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	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	59	54	568	58	77	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	888
Attendance below 90 percent	12	10	13	9	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	0	0	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	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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				55%	52%	57%	53%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	55%	58%	45%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	50%	53%	28%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	54%	63%	61%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				39%	57%	62%	52%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				10%	46%	51%	28%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	50%	53%	37%	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	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	59%	54%	5%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Diagnostics for Reading and Math 2020-2021 for AP1, AP2 and AP3. For 5th Science, Science formative assessments were utilized with average percent correct reported in whole numbers for baseline and mid-year. SSA 2021 is utilized for the Spring scores with percent at 3 or higher.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	49	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	51	58
	Students With Disabilities	39	46	38
	English Language Learners	57	29	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	22	22	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	19	42
	Students With Disabilities	30	65	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	46	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	28	40
	Students With Disabilities	3	14	20
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	22	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	13	23
	Students With Disabilities	29	14	14
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	47	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	41	53
	Students With Disabilities	33	27	51
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	21	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	9	29
	Students With Disabilities	27	42	42
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	34	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	42	46
	Students With Disabilities	30	35	32
	English Language Learners	50	0	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	17	28	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	19	28
	Students With Disabilities	40	45	45
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	31	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	30	25
	Students With Disabilities	23	36	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	29	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	27	23
	Students With Disabilities	30	27	27
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	35	24	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	22	28
	Students With Disabilities	41	28	NA
	English Language Learners	24	12	NA
	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	20	36		12	9						
ELL	57			33							
BLK	35	38	36	23	21	13	26				
HSP	40			35							
FRL	33	34	35	22	20	11	24				
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	14	30	25	23	19	16	11				
ELL	56	58		56	38						
ASN	77			100							
BLK	51	48	35	49	33	10	39				
HSP	60	52		57	41		50				
WHT	64	50		73	60						
FRL	47	45	33	46	29	11	33				
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	15	30	25	24	33	19					
ELL	45			64							
ASN	82			100							
BLK	49	40	27	55	48	26	29				
HSP	50	50		58	55						
WHT	74	64		79	73						
FRL	47	39	24	55	46	28	28				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	200
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	45
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	27
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	38
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	
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
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?

Below 41% threshold for the subgroups of Students with Disabilities, Black and Free/Reduced lunch.

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

Science, Math, ELA Bottom Quartile, Math Gains, Math Bottom Quartile

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

-need for collaborative planning to include VE teachers focused on teacher clarity around standards and how students will demonstrate knowledge.

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

- Overall proficiency increased in all areas
- All areas increased for our Black subgroup in ELA and in Science
- Learning gains and BQ Gains for our FRL subgroup

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

Focus on core instruction aligned to intent of the standards.

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

Planning for acceleration; Knowing what resources to use and how to pace.

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.

Planning Protocols: Understanding, Diagnose (data analysis), Take Action
ELA and Math Content to build teacher understanding of the standards.

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

Schedules and systems for collaborative planning.
Consistent use of planning protocols.
Systems for fidelity of implementation through walkthroughs and feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focus of Teacher and Student Clarity: Teachers will plan standards based lessons which clearly outline what the student is learning and how the student will demonstrate mastery.

Measurable Outcome: School goal to earn 390 points toward school grade.

Monitoring: Monthly data analysis with teachers through PLCs to determine the impact on student achievement. This data analysis includes a breakdown and monitoring of the following specific subgroups: Students with Disabilities, Black and Economically Disadvantaged.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning for teacher clarity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research from John Hattie demonstrates the positive correlation related to teacher clarity and student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly collaborative planning with the support of content coaches utilizing an "understand" protocol. Teachers of Students with Disabilities are scheduled into these collaborative planning sessions based on student IEP goals and focus areas.

Person Responsible Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Feedback cycles focused first on the priority of teacher clarity (learning targets and aligned success criteria).

Person Responsible Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Professional development provided in whole group on the look-fors for the priority of student clarity, and support in planning for student clarity.

Person Responsible Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELA identified due to less than 50% of students scoring at a proficiency level in 3rd, 4th and 5th.

Measurable Outcome:

55% of students in 3rd, 4th and 5th will score a level 3 or higher on 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:

ELA Action Plan Steps will be monitored for implementation through administrative instructional rounds and attendance in collaborative planning sessions. Student data will be analyzed weekly (as available) in the Academic Leadership Team and grade level diagnostic planning sessions. In addition to whole school data, this data will be broken down into subgroups of Students with Disabilities, Black, and Economically Disadvantaged for analysis and next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increase teacher clarity through planning sessions based on teacher understanding of standards aligned instruction: what will students be learning and how will they demonstrate learning within the lesson.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement data from FSA 2021; Teacher knowledge on their current grade level standards and curriculum resources.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development to teachers around how to develop learning targets and objectives with success criteria.

Person Responsible

Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@hcps.net)

Teachers attend internalization session or receive mini-training on the 6 components of internalization. Teachers will then use these components when planning at the beginning of each unit.

Person Responsible

Katrina Barr (katrina.barr@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Weekly collaborative planning sessions with the Reading Resource teacher to include a set protocol.

Person Responsible

Katrina Barr (katrina.barr@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate coaching cycles based on data collected from walkthroughs and planning sessions to provide specific feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible

Katrina Barr (katrina.barr@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Provide support to teachers in planning for small groups based on ongoing data analysis (such as the ELA monthly PMAs, iReady) to include who to target for what purpose, and what resources to use to address the target area. Consideration of subgroup needs for Students with Disabilities, Black students and Economically Disadvantaged subgroup will be considered when planning for small groups.

Person Responsible Sarah Jacobsen Capps (sarah.jacobsencapps@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.

Site data is strong comparative to state data. Based on the Panorama survey comparison from 2020 to fall 2021, there was great improvement in students reporting strong relationships with their teachers and a student growth mindset related to behavior and learning. School data shows a need for supports related to student to student relationships and self control. Implementation of Panther PRIDE, CHAMPS and Second Step lessons for problem solving has begun. The school participated in Start with Hello Week focused on student to student activities, as well as Say No to Drugs. Additional activities will be planned for second semester in the Problem Solving Leadership Team.

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.

A review of the vision and mission resulted in stakeholders deciding to keep the current vision and mission for the 2021-2022 school year. We have implemented "Panther PRIDE" expectations, which include Positive PRIDE Notes (teacher to student, student to student, staff to staff, student to staff, staff to parent) and Positive Office Referrals (for students, includes a call home and a tangible). Additionally, we provide professional development on building staff to student and student to student relationships. CHAMPS has been implemented schoolwide to allow for a common language in communicating procedures to students across all settings.

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

Problem Solving Leadership Team:
Principal
Assistant Principal

Guidance Counselor
 School Social Worker
 Psychologist
 Team Leaders

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00