Clark Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Clark Elementary School

19002 WOOD SAGE DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Delilah Rabe IR O

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

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)	43%
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: A (71%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%)
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

Clark Elementary School

19002 WOOD SAGE DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

Clark Elementary School will provide an educational atmosphere where all students are able to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clark Elementary School will provide all students the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

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
Rabeiro, Delilah	Principal	Oversee day to day operations of the school.
Wackes, Kelly	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, Elementary, will assist with the instructional, administrative, and operational leadership of an elementary school
Ling, Lisa	Psychologist	The School Psychologist will coordinate and implement psychological services, which include academic and behavioral consultation emphasizing the problem-solving model, psychoeducational assessment, individual/group counseling, and crisis intervention. The School Psychologist will work collaboratively with administrators, teachers, other school personnel, parents, and various community agencies to support the educational needs of students.
Addison, Aimee	School Counselor	The Counselor, Elementary School, is responsible for coordinating and implementing the school's counseling services program to include academic advisement and counseling, developmental guidance, career development, and parent/community involvement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/15/2020, Delilah Rabe IR O

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

758

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

2

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	124	105	147	123	124	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	732
Attendance below 90 percent	43	27	29	23	25	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	11	20	22	15	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
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 10/14/2021

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	103	141	127	143	112	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	4	17	6	11	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	20	13	32	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
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	103	141	127	143	112	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	4	17	6	11	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	20	13	32	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
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				75%	52%	57%	72%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	55%	58%	63%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	50%	53%	35%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	54%	63%	79%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				85%	57%	62%	71%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	46%	51%	45%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				75%	50%	53%	71%	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	74%	52%	22%	58%	16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	54%	21%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	88%	57%	31%	64%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%
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 Diagnostic Reading & Math, 5th Grade District Science Baseline Data

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35%	40%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	23%	19%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	31%	53%	44%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	42%	80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	19%	6%
	Students With Disabilities	11%	5%	0%
	English Language Learners	31%	44%	17%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	39%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	32%	19%	30%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	27%	46%
	English Language Learners	36%	18%	17%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	34%	55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	22%	5%
	Students With Disabilities	36%	46%	9%
	English Language Learners	18%	36%	0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50%	39%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33%	21%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	5%	10%
	English Language Learners	40%	30%	27%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29%	24%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	9%	0%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	11%	0%
	English Language Learners	10%	0%	0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55%	51%	56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	33%	13%
	Students With Disabilities	19%	21%	7%
	English Language Learners	25%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40%	38%	65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	14%	14%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	0%	7%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40%	34%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	27%	18%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	7%	7%
	English Language Learners	14%	14%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44%	33%	49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38%	21%	8%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	13%	13%
	English Language Learners	14%	0%	0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69%	80%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57%	65%	63%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	20%	58%
	English Language Learners	26%	65%	41%

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	37	33		44	43		33				
ELL	77	79		84	89		77				
ASN	91	83		94	93		91				
BLK	62	83		59	67	60	54				
HSP	68	81		77	87		65				
MUL	76			88							
WHT	76	63		87	89		75				
FRL	66	82	67	69	76	63	61				
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	31	39	30	41	61	53	40				
ELL	75	79		84	90	75	79				

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
ASN	93	85		99	96		92				
BLK	51	44	29	58	68	52	40				
HSP	65	64	47	82	86	82	70				
MUL	87	77		87	92						
WHT	83	70		87	85		94				
FRL	61	55	39	71	76	63	60				

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	16	28	10	25	33	19	7				
ELL	60	52	28	68	64	33	40				
ASN	90	74		97	86		92				
BLK	55	49	35	61	58	43	54				
HSP	60	57	27	70	63	43	55				
MUL	90	75		95	92						
WHT	77	67	40	83	74	50	86				
FRL	60	54	30	68	62	47	61				

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	73
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	79
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	88
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	64
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	74
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	82
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	77
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	68
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?

ELA lowest 25%
We made gains in this area, however, it is the lowest achieving area. Only 56% of the BQ made gains.

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

ELA lowest 25%
We made gains in this area, however, it is the lowest achieving area. Only 56% of the BQ made gains.

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 Differentiation and small group instruction.
*Increase the effectiveness of PLCs where teachers collaborate to analyze student data to plan for and drive their instruction to meet the needs of individual learners

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

ELA Learning Gains & BQ

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

Data Chats, Team Collaborations & PLCs, Feedback on instructional practice & Progress Moniotoring

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

Incorporate Acceleration to address unfinished learning

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

PD during preplanning on acceleration
Book study on the Knowledge Gap
PLC PD
Differentiation PD
District ELA & Math PDs

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

Implement systems of support to build capacity amongst teachers and build strong collaborative teams that analyze student data to plan for and drive their instruction to meet the needs of individual learners.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At our school we have a diverse population. 10.49% of our population is ELL, 41.06% FRL, 14.12% is Gifted and 12.56% is SWD. Differentiation is a proven instructional practice to meet the needs of our learners.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal for this year is as follows: 80 % ELA Proficiency, 76% ELA Learning Gains, 60% ELA BQ 83 % Math Proficiency, 86% Math Learning Gains, 70% Math BQ 75 % Science Proficiency
Monitoring:	We will monitor through PLCs, data chats, report card reviews and ILT
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Small group instruction 2. Standards based instruction 3. iReady
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective, research-based strategies

Action Steps to Implement

1. Structures for PLC and job-embedded PD for teams
2. Feedback to teams from admin on PLCs
3. Walkthroughs & Observations
4. Quarterly data chats
5. Weekly admin and ILT meetings to review students and progress

Person Responsible	Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELL students scored the lowest out of the ESSA subgroup in the area of ELA in grades 3 & 4. In 3rd grade only 14% of our ELL students were proficient vs. 80% non-proficient. In 4th grade 25% were proficient compared to 75% non-proficient. These are now are incoming 4th and 5th grade students.
Measurable Outcome:	ELL students in grades 3,4,5 will increase proficiency to 50%.
Monitoring:	Progress Monitoring will occur weekly during ILT and after each iReady Diagnostic and ELA monthly assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. daily small group instruction 2. iReady 3. Elevation 4. ELL strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies have been research based and proven effective.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be provided intensive small group instruction.
2. Gen. Ed. will implement ELL strategies when delivering instruction
3. Students will engage with iReady daily
4. Teachers will use Elevation to help improve their practices with our ELL learners.
5. Teachers will utilize and collaborate with the ELL resource teacher for additional support

Person Responsible	Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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 ranked very high among schools across the state. We are number #1,171 out of 1,395. We have a great school climate and culture and safety is our number one priority. We use a Positive Behavior Support System for rewarding behavior schoolwide. In addition, our teachers use their own classroom behavior management systems. Our school also uses CHAMPS.

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.

Creating a school environment that is safe and characterized by mutual respect allows for effective teaching and learning to take place. Clark Elementary provides constant monitoring of hallways, bathrooms, classrooms, and the playground areas by personnel before, during, and after school. Safety Teams, such an an Elopement Team, are established during pre-planning, and those specially-trained faculty and staff carry walkie talkie radios. Clark Expectations are posted inside each classroom. The expectations are taught to the students, and are expected to be followed throughout the school. Students are rewarded for following the Clark Expectations with Cougar Cash and positive reinforcement. Special events and educational programs, such as "Wear Green Day" for positive mental health, and "Wear Blue for Bully Prevention" also helps to promote a safe and respectful learning environment. Most importantly, the teachers and faculty of Clark Elementary show students respect and encourage them to be successful by setting clear and concise classroom expectations, rewarding positive behavior, and helping students set both academic and behavior goals. Clark also offers a
HOST program, Monthly Guidance Lessons, Positive Behavior Support, and follows CHAMPs in the Cafeteria, Lunchroom, and other common areas. Teachers survey parents and students regarding each student's needs, likenesses, cultures, traditions, and additional relevant information. Teachers conference with students and parents to identify strengths, specific areas of need. Other programs and events include: Meet the Teacher; Kindergarten Parent Orientation, Student-Led Conferences; Fall Into Books; STEM Fair Showcase; Veteran's Day Assembly; Kindergarten Holiday Traditions; Multicultural Night and International Bazaar; PTA Family Nights at area restaurants; Student Planners (2nd - 8th); Communication Folders; and Great American Teach-In.
Throughout the year, best practices by faculty and staff are highlighted and celebrated. WOW Wednesdays provide a mid-week snack for teachers. Positive notes are given to faculty and staff throughout the year to encourage and empower teachers and staff. Clark Elementary is a great place to work and learn.

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

Delilah Rabeiro, Principal
Kelly Wackes, Assistant Principal
Aimee Addison, Guidance Counselor
Michelle Lillius, ELL Resource Teacher
Debra Schieler, ESE Specialist
ALL instructional and non-instructional staff
Students, Parents & PTA

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: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00