

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Cypress Creek Elementary School



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Creek Elementary School

4040 19TH AVE NE, Ruskin, FL 33573

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mary Edgar

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Cypress Creek Elementary School

4040 19TH AVE NE, Ruskin, FL 33573

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide quality instruction empowering students to be successful and responsible for their learning in and out of school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a learning community dedicated to the success of every student .

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Moral, Roy	Principal	Running of the school and ensuring the safety and academic achievement of the students.
Edgar, Becky	Assistant Principal	Running of the school and ensuring the safety and academic achievement of the students.
Stinton, Jillian	Reading Coach	Support and assist the teachers and students in the area of reading

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/21/2022, Mary Edgar

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

850

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

11

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	80	154	117	175	135	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	803
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	72	51	62	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	48	23	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	40	37	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	48	23	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	37	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	29	51	79	38	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	262
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/3/2022

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	139	107	144	143	133	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	847
Attendance below 90 percent	56	43	45	47	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	139	107	144	143	133	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	847
Attendance below 90 percent	56	43	45	47	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	43%	53%	56%				45%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						51%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						49%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	48%	50%	50%				52%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%						62%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						53%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	59%	59%				45%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	42%	52%	-10%	58%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	55%	-9%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	53%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	39	37	28	40	44	22				
ELL	39	56	56	43	58	45	16				
BLK	38	64	61	45	58	45	29				
HSP	43	58	58	49	55	49	30				
WHT	50	63		52	67		33				
FRL	42	62	58	47	57	50	30				

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	38	40	29	32	29	20				
ELL	37	50	38	36	38	40	20				
BLK	39	51	58	39	40		40				
HSP	37	39	27	37	34	29	28				
MUL	29			50							
WHT	52	68		57	44		60				
FRL	38	46	42	39	36	32	32				
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	34	41	34	40	67	50	41				
ELL	35	48	46	46	64	50	31				
BLK	42	47	38	54	60	53	44				
HSP	40	50	51	47	60	49	36				
MUL	67	50		67	64						
WHT	52	59	70	58	72		62				
FRL	42	49	50	50	62	55	41				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

4th grade ELA and Math scores increased, 3rd grade math increased and gains increased across grades 3 and 4. 5th grade scores dropped in ELA, Math and Science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

5th grade in ELA, Math and Science need improvement. Students with disabilities need to improve in the area of ELA achievement.

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

This 5th grade group had significant curricular deficiencies due to pandemic. 5th grade teachers struggled to accelerate the students in all curriculum groups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

3rd and 4th grade math.

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

Common, standards based planning. Increased use of formative assessment to guide instruction

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

Teaching assignments in grade 5 have been changed to increase the number of teachers with stronger pedagogical skills. Grade 4 strategies will be implemented in 5th grade planning and use of formative assessments.

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.

Teachers will have professional development in the new standards throughout the year. Weekly data chats and planning will be held for all grade levels.

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

2 reading resource teachers and 2 math resource teachers will be responsible for coordinating and supporting planning sessions and professional development.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

ELA scores need to improve for all groups in grades 3 to 5

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

School wide ELA achievement scores will improve by 10 percent as assessed on annual state progress monitoring.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Formative assessments will be used to attain student progress in ELA achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roy Moral (roy.moral@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Standards based planning and interventions based on student outcomes in formative assessments. Weekly reviews of data for students with disabilities for planning and data review.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Students need to be taught to the standards and assessments used to determine their progress.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Curriculum delivery model for students with disabilities will shift to a greater focus on support facilitation in the classroom.

Person Responsible

Becky Edgar (becky.edgar@hcps.net)

Varying Exceptionality teachers will plan with their grade level students' teachers to provide individualized support in the classroom.

Person Responsible

Becky Edgar (becky.edgar@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Due to having 50 percent or more students lacking in foundational skills we will focus on phonics and phonological awareness in ELA instruction

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

50 percent or more in grades 3 to 5 scored less than a level 3 on FSA. We will be focusing on vocabulary acquisition and comprehension skills during ELA instruction

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade in K-2, using the new progress monitoring system to track students making annual progress, will increase academic achievement by 50% by the end of the school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Each grade in 3-5 using the new progress monitoring system to track students making annual progress, will increase academic achievement by 50% by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monthly review of data will be reviewed by the instructional leadership team to determine which students/ classes/grade levels are making progress towards the ELA goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stinton, Jillian, jillian.stinton@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

We will be using SIPPS and Wonders state approved assessments and state mandated progress monitoring assessments, to determine which students/classes/grade levels are making progress towards the ELA goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The programs from the state are aligned to the B.E.S.T ELA standards. Therefore, standards based instruction created during common planning times will be used throughout the grade levels and monitored by formative data.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaches will lead professional development in phonics instruction and vocabulary attainment based on monthly data reviews, student and teacher needs.	Moral, Roy, roy.moral@hcps.net
Follow up coaching with ELA teachers on strategies taught in professional development sessions.	Edgar, Becky, becky.edgar@hcps.net
Data PLCs and walkthrough data will be used to monitor instructional fidelity and academic achievement	Stinton, Jillian, jillian.stinton@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We communicate with parents through daily school agendas, quarterly progress alerts and conferences. Parent link, school website and social media accounts will be used to communicate on a frequent basis. The SAC committee and PTA are ways that stakeholders can participate in impacting the culture and climate of the school.

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

Parents are invited to participate in a variety of activities and committees so that their input is gathered. Business partners and charitable organizations help support the school for school wide initiatives. The PTA is now fully up and running with mostly parents in charge and in partnership with the school.