Polk County Public Schools

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/slhe/

Demographics

Principal: Lacey Golden

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2022

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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

Spessard L Holland Elementary

2342 EF GRIFFIN RD, Bartow, FL 33830

http://schools.polk-fl.net/slhe/

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	57%

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 Polk 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.

The mission of Spessard L. Holland Elementary is to provide high quality education for all students in an environment where students are eager to learn, willing to serve, and preparing to lead.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Spessard L. Holland is that every student will achieve at his or her maximum potential in engaging learning environments in preparation for the next grade level.

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
Butler, Melody	Principal	
Golden, Lacey	Assistant Principal	
Rodgers, Erin	Dean	
Buchanan, Melanie	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/20/2022, Lacey Golden

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.*

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
654

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
13

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	110	126	123	127	117	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	709
Attendance below 90 percent	40	43	32	39	27	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	210
One or more suspensions	7	10	6	15	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	35	27	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	34	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	28	47	61	21	15	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	15	22	18	16	25	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	2	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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

Sunday 7/31/2022

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	55	123	110	124	124	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	28	27	30	32	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	130	1	7	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
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	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	55	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	17	20	8	17	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	55	123	110	124	124	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	28	27	30	32	28	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	130	1	7	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
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	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	55	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	17	20	8	17	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	55%	47%	56%				55%	51%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%						49%	51%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%						41%	49%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	42%	50%				62%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						57%	56%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	49%	59%				40%	47%	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	65%	52%	13%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	35%	47%	-12%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	65%	56%	9%	62%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	64%	56%	8%	64%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	51%	-7%	60%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	45%	-8%	53%	-16%
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	14	42	45	23	42	44	6				
ELL	38	64		43	64						
BLK	35	50	41	26	43	36	16				
HSP	61	67	43	55	65	53	51				
MUL	42	45		58	64						
WHT	58	65	69	61	61	44	54				
FRL	45	56	48	43	54	42	32				

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	11	8		16			8				
ELL	29	36		25	18		9				
BLK	29	33	20	25	12		31				
HSP	48	33	33	42	20	9	25				
MUL	44			63							
WHT	58	43		57	34	21	57				
FRL	33	30	22	31	25	16	36				

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	23	34	39	32	53	46	15				
ELL	13	43	58	42	50	55	18				
BLK	37	28	46	49	63	39	19				
HSP	51	54	41	59	50	58	21				
WHT	63	54	38	68	58	43	56				
FRL	44	41	42	49	53	50	33				

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58

English Language Learners	
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	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	52
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	59
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	50
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?

We saw moderate growth in proficiency for math and ELA. We saw high growth in learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains in both ELA and math.

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

Our science scores remained stagnant at 45%, a focus on science instruction and progress monitoring in grades K-5 is paramount.

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 science assessment depends upon a student's reading ability, we need to focus on reading within the content areas and a practical knowledge of science through real world experiences and labs. Progressing monitoring was primarily in 4th and 5th grade, we are going to extend progress monitoring down to Kindergarten.

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

Learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains in the area of Mathematics shows the most improvement.

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

The contributing factors this year that accelerated growth in grades 4 and 5 are differentiated instruction based on student need during small group time.

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

We are implementing a 30-minute intervention block for ELA. We also hired a math interventionist to serve in grades 2-4. We are also beginning the process of planning with the Learning Arc conducting walkthroughs with our district created Observation Tool. An emphasis on Science will be given during planning to help teachers appropriately use their extra minutes of science instruction embedded into the master schedule. Cross curricular teaching and learning will be emphasized.

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.

During preplanning, teachers will be given an outline of best practices to include in the 120-minute ELA block and 90-minute Math block with a focus on small group instruction. Throughout the year during staff development days, teachers will be involved in development opportunities surrounding the topics of formative assessments, progress monitoring, MTSS, quality small group resources, cross curricular instruction, and more.

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

A math interventionist will be pulling students in grades 2-4. A STEM lab will be created by the Math Coach to model and help teachers facilitate learning in all content areas.

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 Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Despite high growth in the areas of learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains, we still have 40% of students not making one year's growth, 50%-54% of the bottom quartile students not make growth, and 45%-55% of students not proficient.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Using STAR in grades K-2 and Cambium in grades 3-5, we will show a minimum of 1% increase of proficient students and 2% increase in our ESSA subgroups in both ELA and Math by focusing on developing teachers and intentionally planning in the area of formative assessments.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Student proficiency will be monitored through the assessments, Cambium and/or STAR.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The strategy being implemented for this focus will be the use of formative assessments to ensure differentiated, data driven instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics state "formative assessment produces greater increases in student achievement and is cheaper than other efforts to boost achievement, including reducing class sizes and increasing teachers' content knowledge." Formative assessments were selected due to their high effect size and low cost of implementation.

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.

During the first 60 days of school, teachers will participate in a professional development initiative on formative assessments and how to effectively implement them in the classroom.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

Formative assessments will be purposefully integrated into the collaborative planning process through data chats and alignment of daily common formative assessments throughout the grade level.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

Leadership team will conduct learning walks focused on the effective use of formative assessments. Specific feedback will be given to all teachers that same day.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

During the first 120 days of school, teachers will participate in a professional development session using their formative assessment data to learn how to analyze data and use it effectively to plan differentiated interventions.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

Repeat cycle with individual/ group coaching sessions for particular teachers as needed.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Proficiency is a concern this year for students and a focus on all participants taking an active role in collaborative planning would ensure all students are receiving equitable experiences during Tier 1 instruction.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Students in grades 3-5 will show a minimum of 1% increase in the number of proficient students and a 2% increase in our identified ESSA subgroups in all content areas.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Proficiency data will be analyzed through the Cambium assessment administrations 3 times per year with data chats and an action plan.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Collaborative planning will be organized through the use of the Learning Arc and established planning roles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Cornell University states "the benefits of collaborative learning include: Development of higher-level thinking, oral communication, self-management, and leadership skills. Promotion of student-faculty interaction. Increase in student retention, self-esteem, and responsibility. Exposure to and an increase in understanding of diverse perspectives. Preparation for real life social and employment situations."

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.

During the first scheduled collaborative planning meeting, administration will set year long expectations and norms for planning. New norms will include the expectation of all stakeholders including ESE self-contained and ESE inclusion teachers to attend weekly.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

Administration, coaches, and teacher leaders will model the planning roles through conversation starters, gathering and sharing resources, and integrating it into the Learning Arc. Administration will hold all teachers accountable for their participation and have reflective conversations as needed.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

Using the Learning Arc and collaborative planning roles, equivalent experiences and aligned tasks will be produced and monitored within the classroom. Leadership team will use the district created Observation Tool to monitor implementation.

Person Responsible Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.net)

Data from the Observation Tool will be discussed during leadership team meetings to initiatives coaching cycles for individuals or groups of teachers.

Person Responsible	Lacey Golden (lacey.golden@polk-fl.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.

At Spessard L Holland Elementary, we begin our positive school culture in the office when we greet parents. We implemented a customer service initiative that outlines best practices for secretaries and staff. We purposefully collect phone messages to return calls and solve problems quickly. Each teacher at Spessard L Holland Elementary remains in contact with parents through a ClassDojo app. We plan quarterly parent events in the evenings so all stakeholders can participate and become an active member of the team. During school hours, the Sunshine Committee and leadership team promote staff appreciation and team building opportunities. Our SAC allows for community stakeholders to play an active role in decision making on important topics that affect student achievement. Our PBIS Committee intentionally implement best practice surrounding students behavior so all students are eager to learn, willing to serve, and preparing to lead.

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

Our secretaries play an active role in our customer service policy.
Brittany Deliz coordinates and monitoring our ClassDojo app.
Title I quarterly parent events are scheduled and organized by our academic coaches.
Our Sunshine Committee is ran by Shannon Bumpus, Brenda King, and Leah Locklear.
Our SAC is coordinated by Lacey Golden.
PBIS committee is facilitated by Erin Rodgers Anderson.