

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Pride 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

Pride Elementary School

10310 LIONS DEN DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Paulette English

Start Date for this Principal: 1/27/2020

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
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: A (78%) 2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (67%)
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

Pride Elementary School

10310 LIONS DEN DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[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	No	28%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	79%

School Grades History

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

Pride Elementary will prepare students for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride Elementary will provide an education and the supports which enable each student to excel as a successful and responsible citizen.

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
English, Paulette	Principal	
Humbert, Shelby	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson
Moncrief, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Noll, Elizabeth	Other	ESE Specialist

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/27/2020, Paulette English

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.*

8

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

915

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

5

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

4

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	121	130	159	174	151	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	881
Attendance below 90 percent	1	29	24	23	18	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	14	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	13	10	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	104	150	137	127	141	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	3	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	104	150	137	127	141	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	3	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	80%	53%	56%				86%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	83%						78%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						69%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	83%	50%	50%				83%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	82%						79%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%						64%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	59%	59%				77%	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	85%	52%	33%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	89%	55%	34%	58%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-89%				

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	82%	54%	28%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	88%	57%	31%	64%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	51%	26%	53%	24%
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	68	62	46	62	54	20				
ELL	75	78	67	84	80		59				
ASN	91	92	85	97	90		95				
BLK	63	67	59	62	69	57	52				
HSP	70	83	83	78	80	64	73				
MUL	70	78		71	76	70	60				
WHT	81	82	72	80	78	67	73				
FRL	62	75	68	63	69	50	51				

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	32	29	25	35	29	21	11				
ELL	75	68	64	78	80		70				
ASN	93	86	82	97	90		88				
BLK	60	52	27	57	57	38	50				
HSP	70	63		62	38		60				
MUL	68			48							
WHT	77	73		82	58		76				
FRL	61	51	37	57	40	33	45				
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	57	76	67	55	67	48	48				
ELL	75	73	63	72	80	75	55				
ASN	95	80		97	88		94				
BLK	72	86		72	62		64				
HSP	72	70	67	63	66	54	55				
MUL	78	80		74	80		80				
WHT	89	78	74	85	84	81	76				
FRL	70	77	68	62	70	57	50				

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	78
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	622
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	74
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	89
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	61
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	76
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	76
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	63
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?

Overall ELA and Math overall achievement (proficiency) in 2022 is consistent with overall achievement in 2021 and 2019. Overall gains increased significantly in both Reading and Math (compared to prior year) with a 9% increase in ELA and a 15% in Math. Bottom quartile gains also increased significantly (compared to prior year) with 20% increases in both ELA and Math. Our 2022 bottom quartile gains were similar to 2019 gains in both ELA and Math.

Our lowest performance was in the proficiency of our SWD subgroup - 36% in ELA and 46% in Math. This is an increase compared to 2021(ELA - 32% and Math - 35%), but significantly lower compared to 2019 (ELA - 57% and Math-55%).

The learning gains of our subgroup of black students in the bottom quartile improved 32% in ELA (from 27% to 59%) and 19% in Math (from 38% to 57%). No subgroup data is available for this group in 2019. Overall 2022 achievement of black students was similar to achievement in 2021, but 9% lower in ELA and 10% lower in Math compared to achievement in 2019.

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

ELA Overall Achievement
 SWD Achievement in ELA, Math, & Science
 Overall Achievement of Black Students

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

Students with disabilities were serviced by multiple teachers (sometimes 3-4) resulting in a lack of continuity and potentially impacted both proficiency and gains. We plan to lower the number of teachers working with an individual student to 2-3 as allocated resources and scheduling allow.

Learning gaps were identified and addressed last year and will continued to be addressed through small groups and differentiated instruction.

Our school-wide priorities will focus on exposing students to rigorous learning activities that are aligned with the standards and ensuring that students are taking ownership of their learning.

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

Overall learning gains for all students and subgroups improved.

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

The increases in overall learning gains for the 2021 school year may be attributed to focused instruction and targeting needs of students through differentiated practices as we transitioned back to on-campus learning.

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

- Data driven small group instruction
- Differentiation
- Goal setting and monitoring
- Afterschool tutoring
- Follow-up in bi-monthly PLCs and quarterly academic reviews

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.

- Daily and consistent monitoring of student understanding to plan for small group instruction
- Reteaching/accelerating
- Understanding BEST standards/planning for instruction/facilitating learning using BEST standards
- Utilizing Wonders and STEMscopes curriculum

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

- Grade level content and vertical content PLCs
- Collaborative planning
- Goal setting
- Progress monitoring
- Systematic data review

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus: Instructional Practice, specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction.

Instructional Priorities:

1. Students will take ownership of their learning.
2. Strategies supporting vocabulary development will be incorporated into all content areas.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Although learning gains increased for all subjects and subgroups compared to the prior year, overall achievement (proficiency) were about the same as 2021 and the about the same or lower than in 2019. The increase in learning gains indicate that small group instruction and differentiation during the 2021-2022 school year facilitated the closing of some learning gaps, but additional focus is needed to increase proficiency in all content areas and all subgroups.

2022 ELA Overall achievement increased by only 1% compared to 2021 and decreased 6% compared to 2019.

SWD ELA achievement increased by 4% compared to 2021 and decreased by 21% compared to 2019.

SWD Math achievement increased by 11% compared to 2021 and decreased by 9% compared to 2019.

SWD Science achievement increased by 9% compared to 2021 but decreased by 28% compared to 2019.

Overall ELA achievement of black students was 17% lower than school-wide achievement.

Overall Math achievement of black students was 21% lower than school-wide achievement.

Overall Science achievement of black students was 25% lower than school-wide achievement.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

- 83% of all students will demonstrate ELA proficiency on FAST.
- 40% of SWD students will demonstrate ELA proficiency on FAST.
- 50% of SWD students will demonstrate Math proficiency on FAST.
- 30% of SWD students will demonstrate Science proficiency on FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Focused walk-throughs, feedback, and follow-up
PLT (Professional Learning Community) notes and observation of PLTs
Progress Monitoring
Data Review

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Moncrief (heather.moncrief@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative planning sessions will be used to analyze student data and trends.
Teams will use the

instructional guides and standards to determine small group instruction for acceleration. Solid core instruction will take place that is aligned to the standards. Learning tasks will be aligned and provide opportunities for students to think critically about content.

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

Students will take ownership of their learning as teachers facilitate lessons aligned with grade level standards that include rigorous learning activities.

Strategies supporting vocabulary development will be incorporated into all content areas.

Teaching specific words (rich, robust instruction) to support understanding of texts containing those words.

Teaching word-learning strategies that students can use independently.

Promoting the development of word consciousness and using word play activities to motivate and engage students in learning new words.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Student learning outcomes increase when academic ownership is present and students are responsible for doing the thinking in the classroom.

Student learning outcomes increase when vocabulary is explicitly taught and implemented into all subject areas. A solid vocabulary boosts reading comprehension for students of all ages. The more words students know, the better they understand the text.

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.

Teacher survey to determine support/PD needed to plan and facilitate lessons aligned with grade level standards that include rigorous learning activities.

Person Responsible Paulette English (paulette.english@hcps.net)

Provide assistance with understanding standards and utilizing available resources to plan for standards-aligned instruction.

Person Responsible Heather Moncrief (heather.moncrief@hcps.net)

Create opportunities for teachers to collaborate with colleagues and improve practice.

Person Responsible Paulette English (paulette.english@hcps.net)

Facilitate the collection of walk-through data regarding standards-aligned lessons/rigorous content and demonstration of academic ownership by students.

Person Responsible Heather Moncrief (heather.moncrief@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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

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.

Creating a school environment that is safe and characterized by mutual respect allows for effective teaching and learning to take place. Pride Elementary provides constant monitoring of hallways, bathrooms, classrooms, and the playground areas by personnel before, during, and after school. Safety Teams, such as an Elopement Team, are established during pre-planning, and those specially-trained faculty and staff carry walkie talkie radios. Most importantly, the teachers and faculty of Pride Elementary show students respect and encourage them to be successful by setting clear and concise classroom expectations, rewarding positive behavior, and helping students set both academic and behavior goals.

Research shows that children need to know what is expected of them and they need to be taught what that looks like. Pride is a PBIS school that focuses on learning and implementing the 7 Growth Mindset strategies to all our students and offers monthly Guidance Lessons. We use a school-wide behavior plan to ensure that all students are showing their Lion PRIDE daily. Pride Elementary has our school-wide behavior

expectations posted throughout the school. Students earn Pride Dollars for following the P.R.I.D.E. school-wide expectations (Patience, Respect, Integrity, Determination, Excellence). Students then use their "cash" to purchase incentives from their classroom teacher and/or participate in monthly school-wide reward events. One student from each class is recognized monthly at a special program for demonstrating the focused Mindset for that month.

Our school hosts many family involvement activities, both curriculum and social emotional driven. Events include curriculum nights, a fall festival, music performances, reading celebrations, movie nights, and family mix-n-mingle events at local restaurants. Additional programs and events include Grandparents Day breakfast events, a Veterans Day program; the Great American Teach-In; Meet the Teacher; Student-Led Conferences; Pride Prowl; STEM Fair; SLAM Showcase; Holiday Traditions; First Grade Career Day; PTA Family Nights at area restaurants; student planners and communication folders.

Our Student Ambassadors and Safety Patrols build leadership, team work, and community service.

Teachers conference with parents to identify strengths and specific areas of need a minimum of twice per school year.

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

Administrators oversee the implementation of all the programs at Pride Elementary.

Our student support team and a faculty committee ensure that procedures outlined in our PBIS plan/program are implemented with fidelity and are resulting in positive behavior throughout the school campus (classrooms, hallways, bathrooms, lunchroom, playground, buses). The committee meets regularly to schedule special events in support of PBIS strategies.

Teacher leaders support and mentor members of our Safety Patrols and Student Ambassadors, encouraging them to be positive role models and promote a positive culture.

Our PTA and SAC work closely with the school personnel to reinforce positive culture.