Schwarzkopf Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Schwarzkopf Elementary School

18333 CALUSA TRACE BLVD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Pamela Wilkins

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 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 (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (72%)
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

Schwarzkopf Elementary School

18333 CALUSA TRACE BLVD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	38%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

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.

Building Communication
Enhancing Culture
Active Engagement
Revolutionary Instruction

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating innovative minds for the future.

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
Holley, Cheryl	Principal	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.
Barnes, StephanieE	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair
Beltran, Lizzette	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair
Caro, Lori	Assistant Principal	Collaborate, support, review, and communicate to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tier 2/3) levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/29/2021, Pamela Wilkins

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.*
34

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

611

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

1

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

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	87	94	98	92	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	9	5	3	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	90	86	83	113	111	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	90	86	83	113	111	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	593
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	1	3	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				77%	52%	57%	77%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				63%	55%	58%	60%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	50%	53%	57%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	54%	63%	76%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				89%	57%	62%	78%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75%	46%	51%	66%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				70%	50%	53%	75%	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	80%	52%	28%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2021					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	79%	54%	25%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2021					
	2019	89%	54%	35%	60%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	70%	51%	19%	53%	17%
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, data from baselines in Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	74	84
	Economically Disadvantaged	47	67	81
	Students With Disabilities	26	67	93
	English Language Learners	67	50	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	40	66	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	55	71
	Students With Disabilities	27	63	93
	English Language Learners	23	70	88

Grade 2			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	64	81	90
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	70	78
	Students With Disabilities	72	80	86
	English Language Learners	86	100	100
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	36	78	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	47	73
	Students With Disabilities	56	83	91
	English Language Learners			60

Grade 3			
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	77	82	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	72	75	71
	Students With Disabilities	66	71	74
	English Language Learners	43	43	46
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	33	45	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	78	83	88
	Students With Disabilities	40	53	64
	English Language Learners	10	35	35

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	69	74	83
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	64	78
	Students With Disabilities	67	68	77
	English Language Learners	51	38	52
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	38	56	79
	Economically Disadvantaged	31	44	72
	Students With Disabilities	41	57	78
	English Language Learners	22	29	51

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	76	80	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	62	68	76
	Students With Disabilities	79	80	86
	English Language Learners	40	46	57
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	55	67	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	49	66
	Students With Disabilities	55	63	78
	English Language Learners	4	24	44
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Science	All Students	76	79	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	50	21
	Students With Disabilities	79	82	5
	English Language Learners	28	42	0

Subgroup Data Review

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
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	30	50	55	40	56	62	46				
ELL	55	69		68	77		64				
ASN	90			95							
BLK	76			81							
HSP	67	67	60	67	67	61	57				
MUL	88	70		92	80		77				
WHT	79	69	45	80	76	60	85				
FRL	62	67	60	67	72	65	57				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	36	38	29	58	79	79	25				
ELL	61	62	53	71	97	95	40				
ASN	82	80		94	100						
BLK	57	46		71	69						
HSP	72	70	59	76	88	83	55				
MUL	100	71		96	100						
WHT	79	55	37	87	88	64	83				
FRL	71	69	57	79	87	76	59				

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
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	51	62	63	40	62	44					
ELL	56	52	42	53	64	57					
ASN	74	43		84	79						
BLK	76	85		65	62						
HSP	72	56	48	67	77	69	71				
MUL	89	67		89	100						
WHT	81	62	61	82	80	63	83				
FRL	68	61	53	67	78	69	66				

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	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	67
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	93
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	79
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	65
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	81
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	71
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	63
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?

Lowest quartile, especially in both reading and math.

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

ESE learning gains, ESE teachers were consistently pulling students out of the classroom that year, rather than fusing in with grade level teachers.

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

ELA bottom quartile. Although we were above the state average, it was very minimal and we believe it was because of the lack of consistency with guided reading in all grade levels.

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

Math learning gains. We had implemented small group instruction in all classrooms, focused on foundational skills, and we started using iready more frequently.

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

We had implemented small group instruction in all classrooms, focused on foundational skills, and we started using iready more frequently.

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

We will need to reach each student were they are by helping to build their background knowledge before concepts are taught to assist in helping them to keep up with their peers and with the content being taught. This will require in-depth content knowledge and knowledge of standards by teachers.

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.

Peer coaching with the content area masters at our school.
District wide training
Standards PD

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

In depth data discussion with our new FSA scores from last year by our Instructional Leadership team will be help first in Sept and then multiples times a year to be able to bridge the gaps across content levels but also vertically by grade level.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Align standards based lessons with appropriately rigorous tasks, common instructional language, and assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	There will be significant increase in assessments both in district and state wide improvements in math and reading.
Monitoring:	Regular classroom walkthroughs, formal and informal observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*formal and informal walkthroughs by leadership team and formal and informal observations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent informal and informal observations and walk-throughs will help hold teachers accountable for implementing standards based lessons, the continual use of common language and the use of appropriately rigorous tasks and assessments that directly align with the standards being taught.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Grade- level collaboration meetings weekly to plan for rigorous tasks and include common academic language.
2. Walkthroughs with feedback and fidelity checks.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Guided reading and small group math instruction *ELA bottom quartile data declined *Guided reading was not consistent in all classrooms *Data shows a need for small group instruction in ELA and math
Measurable Outcome:	*formal and informal walk-throughs *observation data *i-ready data *ILT/PLC data *math monthly data
Monitoring:	Through district and state wide data assessments as well as walk-through and observational data discussions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*Formal and informal observations *Formal and informal walk-throughs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Frequent formal observations, informal observations, and walk-throughs will hold teachers accountable for implementing and holding small groups with fidelity in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

Walk-throughs with feedback and fidelity checks.

Person Responsible Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	i-ready data shows the need for vocabulary and phonemic awareness along with ILT input across all grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	i-ready data will increase in area of foundational skills.
Monitoring:	Through continual progress monitoring data on i-Ready.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	*RTI groups *Computer based programs *spiral review
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Through continual conversations with teachers in professional learning communities and in out ILT's work samples, FSA data, i-Ready data, there is a need for foundational skills to be continually embedded at all grade levels in all content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

i-Ready fidelity

Person Responsible Cheryl Holley (cheryl.holley@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.

*Faculty PLC breakout sessions with exemplar teacher leaders
*Peer coaching and team walk-throughs
*Emphasis on common teacher language across strategies and grade levels
*Computer/Research based programs, spiral review

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 meaningful parent involvement through out PTA, SAC, Papa Bears program, curriculum and family nights, and continuous teacher/parent communication.
*Celebrating personal achievement and good behavior with our Citizen of the Month assemblies, report card award assemblies, Bear Bucks program which highlights positive student behavior.
*Establishing school and classroom norms at the beginning of the year which builds our values and expectations that help to make a successful year.
*Teachers, administrators, and faculty all model the behaviors in which we want the kids to exhibit.
*Character Guidance program in which we focus on model character traits that are important in becoming and developing in a productive and caring citizen.
*Encouraging innovation in our classrooms through the use of one to one technology helps to heighten the level of interest, concentration, and overall enjoyment as the students master academic content in innovative ways.

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

All school staff has a role in promoting a positive school culture. Every single staff member can in some way create positivity in our school. Our administration, instructional and non-instructional staff will all play a role by working together to accomplish the ideas listed above. We will work closely with our PTA and our SAC committee to ensure that we are involving our parents and community as it takes the entire village to promote and maintain a positive environment both on and off campus.

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: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**