

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Essrig 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

Essrig Elementary School

13131 LYNN RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Beverly Smith

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)	99%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (61%) 2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%)
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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Essrig Elementary School

13131 LYNN RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[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	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

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.

Preparing Panthers for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a culture for learning that encourages and motivates all students to reach their highest individual potential.

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
Smith, Beverly	Principal	
Sissel, Clarissa	Assistant Principal	
Tremper, Maria	ELL Compliance Specialist	
Fowler, Kimberlee	Magnet Coordinator	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/21/2022, Beverly Smith

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.*

0

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

550

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

3

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

3

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	111	100	91	94	86	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	0	29	19	27	18	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	6	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	0	3	6	0	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	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 9/1/2022

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	103	93	87	95	93	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	34	23	20	34	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	15	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	0	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	1	0	12	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	103	93	87	95	93	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	34	23	20	34	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	15	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
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	0	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	1	0	12	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	53%	56%				66%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						61%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%						47%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	50%	50%				59%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%						57%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%						34%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	59%	59%				65%	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	64%	52%	12%	58%	6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	55%	10%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	64%	54%	10%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	57%	54%	3%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	57%	2%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	60%	54%	6%	60%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	64%	51%	13%	53%	11%
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	16	41	44	36	72	77	18				
ELL	51	70	75	61	75		36				
ASN	23	45		58	82						
BLK	39	50		50	65		40				
HSP	50	59	56	59	70	64	47				
WHT	66	73	70	76	81	80	59				
FRL	42	53	54	54	72	73	41				

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	21	32	38	14	43	56	6				
ELL	50	50		52	50		29				
ASN	59			65							
BLK	33			33							
HSP	45	40	31	44	35	46	26				
WHT	65	56		58	44		40				
FRL	42	37	26	42	38	50	22				
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	21	38	37	26	44	42	28				
ELL	57	54	36	55	54	38	53				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	72	75		56	31						
HSP	63	58	50	58	57	31	63				
MUL	61	58		56	67						
WHT	69	63	29	60	58	46	71				
FRL	61	58	50	52	55	37	54				

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	64
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	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	65
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	58
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	61
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	72
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	60
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?

Essrig improved in all 7 categories according to FSA. We had a significant increase in student achievement and gains in math. Math proficiency increased by 16 points, Math gains increased by 35 points, Math BQ increased by 24 points. Additionally, we made significant improvements in ELA BQ, going up by 32 points. Science increased by 14 points.

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

ELA proficiency shows the greatest need for improvement as well as Science.

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

The contributing factors for this data is a lack of knowledge in research based small group instruction. Professional development will be taken to address this deficit. Additionally, common planning time will continue so that implementation of these strategies are supported and implemented.

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

Math gains for all students and ELA bottom Quartile both showed the most improvements according to FSA.

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

Common morning planning and the implementation of a interactive data wall in the planning area were the contributing factors for this improvement.

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

Research based small group instructional strategies will be implemented in order to accelerate learning.

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.

Reciprocal teaching, reading recovery, fluency/repeated reading based strategies.

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

Extended learning program during the day and after school will be implemented to ensure sustainability.

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 shows the area in need of most improvement. Only 53% of students are proficient on FSA in 2022.

Measurable Outcome:

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

62% of our students will be proficient on the F. A. S. T Florida assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Walk-throughs, data chats, feedback, and progress monitoring by teachers, students and administrators.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Beverly Smith (beverly.smith@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Reciprocal Teaching, Reading Recovery and Repeated Reading/Fluency interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

When student reading proficiency increases, all other areas are impacted.

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.

We will train all ELA teachers on Reciprocal Teaching.

Person Responsible

Clarissa Sissel (clarissa.sissel@hcps.net)

We will train all ELA teachers on Reading Recovery.

Person Responsible

Clarissa Sissel (clarissa.sissel@hcps.net)

We will train all ELA teachers on Repeated Reading and Fluency Strategies.

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

48% of our students in K-2 are performing at mid to late grade level according to i-Ready. We will implement Reciprocal Teaching, Reading Recovery and Repeated Reading/Fluency interventions.

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

48% of 3rd grade students scored proficiency on FSA 2022. We will implement Reciprocal Teaching, Reading Recovery and Repeated Reading/Fluency interventions.

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)

55% of our students in grades k-2 will be proficient on the F.A.S.T. Florida Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

62% of our students in 3rd grade will be proficient on the F.A.S.T. Florida 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.

We will use the F.A.S.T. progress monitoring and common monthly formative assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Smith, Beverly, beverly.smith@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 use Reciprocal Teaching, Reading Recovery and Repeated Reading/Fluency interventions.

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 above strategies have proven significant positive results according to the DOE.

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
We will utilize Literacy leadership by providing professional develop on research based reading strategies.	Sissel, Clarissa, clarissa.sissel@hcps.net
We will utilize professional learning communities to increase teacher collaboration in order to increase teacher effectiveness.	Smith, Beverly, beverly.smith@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.

Teachers will be trained monthly in Conscious Discipline strategies to improve school culture. The school will participate in monthly school family celebrations to increase connectivity of students and staff. Additionally, Restorative circles will be implemented in grades 3 - 5. Classroom guidance lesson will be delivered by school counselor.

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

Beverly Smith, Conscious Discipline Trainer
Clarissa Sissel, Restorative Circles
Tracey Gillett, Classroom Guidance