

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Egypt Lake Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Egypt Lake Elementary School

6707 N GLEN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Holly Magaditsch

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (54%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Egypt Lake Elementary School

6707 N GLEN AVE, Tampa, FL 33614

[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	95%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

All students will be provided equitable experiences which build their foundation for intellectual and social growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering Learners for Life Long Success

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
Magaditsch, Holly	Principal	The Principal is responsible for the overall management of the school and the academic success of students.
Semler, Loree	SAC Member	Teacher is responsible for teaching kindergarten as well as chairing SAC.
Roberts, Shaleema	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is responsible for supporting the Principal in the overall management of the school in order to ensure student success.
Keupp, Victoria	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Reading Resource Teacher - responsible for supporting classroom teachers with ELA instruction in order for them to be able to meet the needs of all learners by offering meaningful and targeted instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Holly Magaditsch

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Total number of students enrolled at the school

427

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

9

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

6

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	73	73	64	61	69	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	414
Attendance below 90 percent	0	29	22	17	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	18	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	23	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
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	0	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Monday 8/22/2022

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	63	64	55	72	73	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	9	9	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	63	64	55	72	73	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	9	9	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	57%	53%	56%				57%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						65%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						58%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	66%	50%	50%				60%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	64%						55%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	59%	59%				51%	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	37%	52%	-15%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

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	55%	54%	1%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	57%	-14%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	63%	54%	9%	60%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	48%	51%	-3%	53%	-5%
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	36	57		63	52		18				
ELL	49	48	40	66	68	47	41				
BLK	47	52		51	55	50	18				
HSP	57	58	43	69	67	43	51				
WHT	64			73							
FRL	56	57	44	66	63	44	46				
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	33	77		38	80		21				
ELL	59	70		61	68		40				
BLK	38			57							
HSP	61	63	73	64	69	73	45				
WHT	64			71							
FRL	58	69	80	63	75	79	43				
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	36	58		39	45	45	18				
ELL	57	67	50	57	55	57	49				
BLK	33	63		47	63		50				
HSP	60	64	52	59	52	50	52				
WHT	71	85		82	77						
FRL	54	65	60	59	55	58	47				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	46
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	56
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	69
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	55
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?

Lower levels of student proficiency. Students not making as any gains or bottom quartile gains.

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

There is a need to push proficiency by strengthening core instruction related to grade level standards and by having data driven small groups based on student needs.

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

Student gains and proficiency will increase when teachers use individual student data to set goals, plan differentiated learning tasks based on the individual's point of need and regularly monitor student progress towards proficiency.

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

Proficiency

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

Tier 1 instruction was strong as a result of collaborative planning sessions with site based, and district coaches.

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

Common planning sessions, data chats, small group planning, vertical planning and disaggregation, MTSS/PSLT

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.

Differentiation, knowledge of standards, Professional Learning Communities, Data

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

Staff (Reading Resource), planning structures, data chat documents, student goal setting.

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.

Classroom walkthrough data showed a lack of small group instruction last year. There were times instructional decisions were made without consulting student data or grade level trends. Student learning will be positively impacted when student data is used to plan effective small group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

57% of students demonstrated ELA proficiency on FSA in 2021-2022 school year. This year, 80% of students will demonstrate ELA proficiency on the FSA in the 22-23 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Students will receive small group instruction based on Iready data trends where reading strategies will be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Magaditsch (holly.magaditsch@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students will receive small group instruction based on Iready data trends where reading strategies will be used.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

1. Reading Resource will conduct weekly planning sessions in grades K-5.
2. District resources will be used during these weekly planning sessions.
3. Lesson planning will include Iready small group lessons.
3. Iready progress will be printed each Thursday afternoon and notations made by administration.
4. Reading Resource teacher will pull small guided reading groups in grades 3-5.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

57.9% of students were marked as below level on the Spring 2022 iReady Diagnostic.

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

45% of students in grades 3-5 scored below a level 3 on the Spring 2022 FSA Assessment.

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)

80% of all students will be proficient as measured by the STAR Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

80% of students in grades 3-5 will be proficient as determined by the FAST Assessment.

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.

School will meet weekly for collaborative planning, biweekly for PLCs, and hold data chats with coaches as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Magaditsch, Holly, holly.magaditsch@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?

Regular administrative feedback on teaching, Regular times for planning and data discussions.

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?

Getting regular feedback and collaboration times has been shown to increase best practices at the building level. These planned times will allow teachers to plan differentiated lessons together will meet the needs of students. Administrative feedback on lessons will encourage best practices in the classroom.

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
Weekly Collaborative Planning	Magaditsch, Holly, holly.magaditsch@hcps.net
Administrative Feedback	Magaditsch, Holly, holly.magaditsch@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.

PBIS expectations are encouraged and communicated in classrooms and common areas. Points are awarded and students can purchase incentives at the class and school level. The guidance counselor plans small group guidance lessons. Weekly positive referrals are recognized, as well as monthly character celebrations. The social work plans attendance incentives and manages individual attendance contracts.

Parents are invited to be a part of SAC and Parent/Family engagement events. All communication is provided in English and Spanish.

Community partners donate supplies to our students such as Advent Hospital Carrollwood and Tampa Bay Harvest.

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

Jessica Vazquez - Parent and Family Engagement
Jasmin Ruger - Guidance Counselor
Ariana Pickett - Social Worker