

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Frost Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	19

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Temeka Lewis

Start Date for this Principal: 4/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Frost Elementary School

3950 S FALKENBURG RD, Riverview, FL 33578

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">80%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">85%</p>

School Grades History

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

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 are committed to prepare individual learners for success in life with a positive, student-centered community that supports high expectations for all.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Providing lasting imprints for lifelong learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mikell, Tiffany	Principal	Responsible for full operations and achievement of Frost Elementary School. By providing strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, administering the budget, hiring and evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.
Long, Krista	Assistant Principal	Providing strategic direction to the school, assessing teaching methods, monitoring student achievement, encouraging parent and community involvement, revising policies and procedures, evaluating staff, and overseeing facilities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 4/29/2019, Temeka Lewis

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

560

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

3

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

5

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	94	89	96	83	79	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	30	25	25	27	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	141
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	60	27	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	29	30	20	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116

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	1	0	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	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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 9/30/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	91	83	93	73	86	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	16	16	21	14	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
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	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	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	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	3	11	10	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	91	83	93	73	86	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	16	16	21	14	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	13	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	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	3	11	10	3	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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				55%	52%	57%	56%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				55%	55%	58%	61%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	59%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	54%	63%	59%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	57%	62%	70%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	46%	51%	63%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	50%	53%	55%	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	59%	55%	4%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	62%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	57%	-3%	64%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

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

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-5 ELA and Math - Iready: Relative Placement to Grade
 Grade 5 Science - District Baseline and Mid-year Assessments

		Grade 1			
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		27%	39%	62%
	Economically Disadvantaged		20%	23%	30%
	Students With Disabilities		0%	22%	44%
	English Language Learners		8%	42%	55%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		11%	24%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged		8%	19%	23%
	Students With Disabilities		0%	33%	33%
	English Language Learners		0%	8%	45%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	40%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	21%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	17%	58%
	English Language Learners	7%	29%	39%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7%	16%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17%	21%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	33%
	English Language Learners	7%	20%	38%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44%	63%	73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	32%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	29%	57%
	English Language Learners	13%	25%	43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	30%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12%	5%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	29%	29%	29%
	English Language Learners	0%	38%	43%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39%	44%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25%	18%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	39%	39%	35%
	English Language Learners	0%	10%	20%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12%	27%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	10%	25%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	50%	59%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	10%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25%	34%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	13%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	13%	38%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24%	23%	46%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	21%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	38%	13%	50%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	17%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40%	33.6%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	24%	13%	17%
	Students With Disabilities	26.55%	39.07%	33%
	English Language Learners	30.95%	14.39%	10%

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	25			30							
ELL	41	57		33	44		18				
BLK	39	38		34	28	30	21				
HSP	41	58		35	46		28				
MUL	71			73							
WHT	61			57							
FRL	40	44	64	39	36	36	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	47	52	40	47	38	17					
ELL	39	42		42	58	60					
BLK	49	58	47	46	59	61	38				
HSP	54	57	58	55	57	53	50				
MUL	73	60		55	50						
WHT	68	44		73	64		50				
FRL	50	54	45	49	58	56	38				
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	32	50	42	50	61		42				
ELL	25	61		38	75	64	20				
BLK	58	58	67	53	65	58	50				
HSP	52	68	57	54	67	67	54				
MUL	50	60		79	60						
WHT	57	56		70	91		67				
FRL	52	60	61	55	66	58	52				

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	47
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	92%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	32
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	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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	59
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	45
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?

In 2018, Student math gains were 70% and in 2019, student math gains were 59%. This was 11% decrease in Math learning gains.
 In 2018, students in the bottom 25% made learning gains of 63%, and students in the bottom 25% made learning gains of 57%. This is a decrease of 6% in the bottom quartile for learning gains in Math.

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

The data component showing the greatest area of need is our Math bottom 25% and ELA proficiency. When analyzing school comparison data, Grade 3 ELA decreased by 10%. In 2018, they scored 60% and in 2019 scoring 50%. In 2018, the data showed statewide 3rd grade proficiency was at 58% with a gain of 3%. In 2019, statewide 3rd grade proficiency was at 57%, with a decrease of 8%. This indicates a need to focus on the bottom quartile in our Math and our ELA proficiency.

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

Possible contributing factors included the lack of resources specific to the standards throughout the grade levels. There was a possible lack of adequate progress monitoring that was inconsistently analyzed to support deficiencies.

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

ELA maintained at least a 50% proficiency level in all subject areas and most grades. The proficiency level of ELA only decreased by 1%. In 2018, the ELA proficiency was 56% and in 2019, the ELA proficiency level was 55%.

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

PLC planning was consistent and data analysis was completed with fidelity.

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

Weekly PLC planning meetings that analyze data with fidelity. Small group tutoring/intervention for students.

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.

Our reading coach will attend all PLC planning meetings.
Utilize monthly PD on Monday afternoons based on the data.
Coaching support

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

Non-evaluative walkthroughs by coaches and administration.
Weekly PLC planning meetings to analyze data with fidelity.
Bi-weekly grade level team meetings with coaches and administration focusing on current data trends.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Based on 2020 FSA data, we were below 50% proficiency in ELA.

Measurable Outcome:

Students proficiency will be at least 50% in reading based on the 2022 FSA.

Monitoring:

Based on iReady diagnostic that is taken three times a year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Mikell (tiffany.mikell@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

standard based planning with the reading coach weekly

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

standard based instructional planning will give the teachers the necessary skills and tools necessary to challenge students and unlock their potential.

Action Steps to Implement

Standard based instructional planning

*Teachers will participate in grade level/subject area planning sessions (with reading coach, and RTI coach on a weekly basis, team planning in PLCs). Completed planning templates will be uploaded and monitored with feedback through Office 365 shared drive.

VE/ESE, ESOL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level planning sessions weekly to ensure SWD and ELL students are engaged in grade level content. Planning templates will be made available for all VE/ESE teachers as well as ELL paras in order to align their work with these subgroups.

Through planning, the reading coach will lead teachers in strategies to engage and support FRL students in order to increase achievement.

RTI resource teacher will use results of planning activities to track and monitor all ESSA subgroups, providing feedback and data related to each group.

Person Responsible

Tiffany Mikell (tiffany.mikell@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.

In 2019, data showed Frost Elem reported 0.5 incidents per 100 students. The data reports 0.54 per 100 students were identified under violent incidents, 0 property, and 0 drug/public order incidents. In 2019, Frost = 0 suspensions vs State = 3.9 suspensions. The data component showing the primary area of concern is violent incidents.

The school culture will be monitored through PBIS and a school wide behavior management plan.

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.

Effective communication is essential for building school-family partnerships. It constitutes the foundation for all other forms of family involvement in education. We work to communicate every child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media platforms. Parents are invited to join SAC and PTA. Each committee meets monthly to discuss budget, events, and student needs.

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

Business partners that provide incentives for both students and teachers.
 Parents that participate in school wide family events.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
			Total:
			\$0.00