Cork Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cork Elementary School

3501 N CORK RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sherri Lyn Black

Start Date for this Principal: 8/6/2012

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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%)
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

Cork Elementary School

3501 N CORK RD, Plant City, FL 33565

[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	76%

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		B	B	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.

Cork Elementary exemplifies a safe and nurturing environment where people from diverse cultures and beliefs come together to build confidence, excel in learning, strengthen inter-personal relationships, and be a stellar example of our families, community, and district.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Learners today, leaders tomorrow.

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
Black, Sherri	Principal	It is the responsibility of the principal to set the purpose of the leadership team which is to ensure high quality core instructional practices and support interventions and enrichment for students in need of differentiated instruction to be successful.
Manhertz, Rosemarie	Assistant Principal	It is the responsibility of the assistant principal to assist the leadership team and to ensure high quality core instructional practices and support interventions and enrichment for students in need of differentiated instruction to be successful.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/6/2012, Sherri Lyn Black

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.*
9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
34

Total number of students enrolled at the school
650

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	101	101	116	111	107	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	0	15	19	12	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in Math	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	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	5	2	7	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
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
Tuesday 8/31/2021

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	89	120	103	108	85	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	7	20	11	17	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	15	3	13	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	89	120	103	108	85	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	7	20	11	17	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	15	3	13	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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				56%	52%	57%	56%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				59%	55%	58%	55%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	50%	53%	49%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				57%	54%	63%	54%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				64%	57%	62%	53%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	46%	51%	40%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				62%	50%	53%	60%	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	55%	52%	3%	58%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	55%	-3%	58%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	47%	54%	-7%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	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 Data for ELA and Math
FSA Data for Science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	37	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	31	48
	Students With Disabilities	0	17	17
	English Language Learners	15	29	33
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10	21	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	15	36
	Students With Disabilities	6	6	17
	English Language Learners	7	7	19

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16	38	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	33	58
	Students With Disabilities	6	24	59
	English Language Learners	0	7	20
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	35	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	30	56
	Students With Disabilities	6	18	41
	English Language Learners	4	7	33

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38	47	57
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	40	51
	Students With Disabilities	11	24	43
	English Language Learners	7	25	28
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12	27	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	20	33
	Students With Disabilities	7	21	33
	English Language Learners	0	6	13

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	38	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	27	40
	Students With Disabilities	14	21	29
	English Language Learners	0	6	12
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	22	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	16	31
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	24

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	35	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	23	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	13	6
	English Language Learners	0	11	22
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18	32	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	23	53
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	44
	English Language Learners	12	28	56
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			42
	Economically Disadvantaged			23
	Students With Disabilities			8
	English Language Learners			0

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	26		17	42	38	8				
ELL	26	42	50	23	49	50	19				
HSP	32	45	50	29	50	46	30				
WHT	62	62		53	62	40	56				
FRL	35	47	60	29	49	42	26				

	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	20	56	56	30	51	33	35				
ELL	38	49	52	41	58	61	27				
HSP	45	56	51	46	59	60	37				
WHT	63	60	56	63	69	50	77				
FRL	48	55	53	50	60	54	57				

	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	20	42	45	35	37	30	22				
ELL	36	44	44	32	36	33	26				
HSP	42	50	45	42	44	33	48				
WHT	67	58	55	63	57	44	68				
FRL	49	55	53	48	52	40	51				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	394
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
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	
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 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	56
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	43
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?

The trends emerging are that SWD, ELL and FRL students were adversely affected during the pandemic. Each subgroup displayed significant declines in proficiency in ELA, Math and Science.

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

Math is the greatest need for improvement based off of the 2021 FSA and i-Ready diagnostic data.

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

Loss of consistent quality instruction during the pandemic due to student and teacher absenteeism, student and teacher quarantining, and lack of electronic resources (computers and internet connectivity) for students at home.

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

Our bottom quartile increased by six percentage points in ELA on the 2021 FSA.

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

There was an increase in minutes allotted to teacher-led, small group instruction which allowed teachers to strengthen differentiated instruction. The support for bottom quartile students was intensified through the use of a push-in model. Purposeful collaboration and planning for differentiated instruction involving the general education teacher, ESE teacher, and the Reading Coach was prioritized.

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

The use of small group instruction with day-time tutors. Additionally, coaches will have increased planning time with teachers focused on acceleration of selected standards. Professional development

will also be provided to assist teachers with targeted instruction for the groups of students falling below the ESSA standard.

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.

Mini-professional development sessions will be provided for teachers on the new implementation of learning ladders in ELA and Math to support planning for acceleration. Additionally, the coaches will facilitate book studies focused on learning strategies that will address the needs of the ESSA subgroups. The books selected for ELA are Shifting the Balance (Burkins and Yates) for primary teachers and Balanced Literacy (Fischer and Frey) for intermediate teachers. The book selected for Math is Teaching Math to Multilingual Students (Chval, Smith, Pinow, and Trigos-Carrillo).

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

We are shifting our focus from remediation of student learning to accelerating student learning. In addition to analyzing data at grade level and teacher level, the coaches will support the teachers in analyzing and tracking SUBGROUP data quarterly which will contribute to the ILT's ability to create an action plan involving Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our data indicates that a deficit in prerequisite skills is impacting number sense for not only our SWD students and ELL students, but other subgroups of students as well.
Measurable Outcome:	Our FSA Math data indicates that only 39% of all students were proficient which was an 18% decrease from the previous year. Additionally, all subgroups fell below the ESSA Federal Index Score of 41% proficiency. We will increase the percentage of proficient students in Math by 11 percentage points overall and increase the subgroup proficiency score to be above the ESSA Federal Index Score of 41%.
Monitoring:	Proficiency will be monitored by monthly Hillsborough County district assessments and i-Ready Diagnostic data. In addition to analyzing data at grade level and teacher level, the coaches will support the teachers in analyzing and tracking SUBGROUP data quarterly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Coaching in Math will focus on lesson planning with teachers to implement acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for one hour under the supervision of the Assistant Principal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation (1.29) and Acceleration (.68) both have high effectiveness ratings on John Hattie's index of strategies that influence student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaching in Math will focus on lesson planning with teachers to implement acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for an hour under the supervision of the Assistant Principal. For Professional Development, the Math Coach will lead a book study of Teaching Math to Multilingual Students (Cheval, Smith, Pinnow, & Trigo-Carrillo) at monthly Content Cadre Meetings.

Person Responsible	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our data reflects a deficit in foundational skills and vocabulary which impedes proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Our FSA ELA data indicates that only 46% of all students were proficient, which was a 10% decrease from the previous year. Additionally, all subgroups fell below the ESSA Federal Index Score of 41% proficiency. We will increase the percentage of proficient students in ELA by 14 percentage points and increase the subgroup proficiency score to be above the ESSA Federal Index Score of 41%.
Monitoring:	Proficiency will be monitored by monthly Hillsborough County district assessments and i-Ready Diagnostic data. In addition to analyzing data at grade level and teacher level, the coaches will support the teachers in analyzing and tracking SUBGROUP data quarterly. Wonders Foundational Skills Assessments (Tier 1 and Tier 2) and SIPPS Mastery Tests (Tier 3) will be used to progress monitor foundational skills in K-2. MAZE passages will be used to progress monitor vocabulary in grades 2-5.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherri Black (sherri.black@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Coaching in ELA will focus on lesson planning with teachers to implement acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for one hour under the supervision of the Assistant Principal.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Differentiation (1.29) and Acceleration (.68) both have high effect ratings on John Hattie's index of strategies that influence student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Instructional Coaching in ELA will focus on implementation of common planning protocols with teachers to support acceleration and differentiation of instruction at all grade levels. This will occur weekly for an hour under the supervision of the Assistant Principal. For Professional Development, the Reading Coach will lead a book study featuring Shifting the Balance (Burkins and Yates) with primary teachers and Bringing Words to Life (Isabel Beck) with intermediate teachers at monthly Content Cadre Meetings. Intermediate teachers will continue to implement the Vocabulary Instructional Routine from Bringing Words to Life (Beck) and vocabulary routines from i-Ready LAFS, as well as i-Ready Tools for Instruction. Primary teachers will use the Wonders Vocabulary Intervention as a Tier 1 vocabulary intervention and foundational skills will be addressed through Wonders (Tiers 1 and 2) and SIPPS (tier 3). Daytime tutors will be hired to address "unfinished learning" in reading for our subgroups of students not meeting the 41% ESSA Federal Index Score.

Person Responsible	Rosemarie Manhertz (rosemarie.manhertz@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.

Cork Elementary welcomed two Behavior Support Units for Emotionally Behaviorally Disturbed students during the 2020-2021 school year. Our discipline referrals increased as a result of these students and their behaviors from 15 discipline incidents in 2019-20202 to 50 discipline incidents in 2020-2021. Our schoolwide behavior plan includes being proactive with instructing our students on leadership skills at monthly "community meetings" (grade levels) using Covey's, The 7 Habits of Happy Kids.

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.

Our mission statement is long, but truly reflects how we feel about educating our Cork students, "Cork Elementary exemplifies a safe and nurturing environment where people form diverse cultures and beliefs come together to build confidence, excel in learning, strengthen inter-personal relationships, and to be a stellar example of our families, community and district." We use the 7 Habits of Happy Kids (based on Covey's 7 Habits of Highly Effective People) to teach our students how to become self-reliant, take initiative, plan ahead, set and track goals, complete their assignments, prioritize their time, manage their emotions, be considerate of others, express their viewpoint persuasively, resolve conflicts, find creative solutions, value differences, work together, and lead a balanced life. Teachers incorporate the habits into morning meetings and daily instruction. Community (grade level) meetings are held monthly to teach and ingrain the habits.

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

Administration, Student Services Personnel, ILT, Teachers, Parents, and all staff members work together to promote a positive school culture and safe environment for students. Administration and classroom teachers instruct the student in the 7 Habits

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**