Zolfo Springs Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Zolfo Springs Elementary School

3215 SCHOOL HOUSE RD, Zolfo Springs, FL 33890

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/zolfo_springs/index.htm

Demographics

Principal: Suzanne Stagg E

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (63%)
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 Hardee 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

Zolfo Springs Elementary School

3215 SCHOOL HOUSE RD, Zolfo Springs, FL 33890

www.hardee.k12.fl.us/zolfo_springs/index.htm

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	63%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hardee 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.

Achieving excellence in education in a safe, positive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Building learning partnerships with home, school, and community to ensure personal and academic excellence.

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
Stagg, Suzanne	Principal	
Hunnicutt, Juliann	Teacher, K-12	Resource Teacher Leadership Team
Smith, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Leadership Team
LaJeunesse, Leigh	Assistant Principal	
Reyes, Josie	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Leadership Team
Shivers, Sandy	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Leadership Team
Thomas, Ketus	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Leadership Team
Thornton, Blaire	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Leadership Team
Bryant, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Leadership Team

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/1/2021, Suzanne Stagg E

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.*
6

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

589

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

4

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

8

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	108	110	95	94	98	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	4	9	12	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	14	12	3	6	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	9	11	2	23	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	18	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	13	13	18	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	2	5	4	6	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	7	6	2	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/22/2022

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	107	109	93	95	95	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	6	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	11	10	5	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	10	10	5	11	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	12	12	14	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	2	4	5	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	11	10	2	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	107	109	93	95	95	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	9	12	6	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	11	10	5	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	10	10	5	11	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	12	12	14	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	2	4	5	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	7	6	2	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	54%	54%	56%				56%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						54%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						47%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	66%	45%	50%				72%	71%	63%
Math Learning Gains	60%						76%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						74%	61%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	64%	59%				41%	43%	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	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	57%	-1%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	48%	6%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	67%	69%	-2%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	73%	-2%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	77%	62%	15%	60%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	37%	42%	-5%	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	20	21	19	57	61	62	18				
ELL	39	38	21	52	53	62	16				
HSP	50	51	33	62	58	55	38				
WHT	63	51	50	77	64		70				
FRL	51	50	45	63	56	52	42				

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	37	40		58	75		26				
ELL	41	33		63	55		20				
HSP	56	52	69	74	71	69	26				
WHT	61	40		71	50		39				
FRL	53	44	57	71	64	73	27				

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	39	42	40	57	85	88	21				
ELL	38	46	50	60	69	54	24				
HSP	52	49	47	69	75	74	32				
WHT	63	61	50	77	78	73	53				
FRL	50	47	42	68	71	69	37				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
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	63
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	52
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?

3rd and 4th grade ELA proficiency dropped by in comparison to 20-21. 3rd grade math also dropped by 25 points. 5th grade Science scores increased by 16 points. ZSE's SWD subgroup ELA proficiency decreased in 20-21 to 27.9% of the SWD subgroup scored a level "1" in 21-22 50% scored a level "1".

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

3rd and 4th Grade ELA are the areas that show the greatest need for improvement.

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 in 3rd and 4th grade missed a great deal of academic instruction during the 19/20, 20/21, and 21/22 school year due to the COVID pandemic. During the 22/23 school year, professional development incorporating high impact teaching strategies and the Best Standards will be provided. We will also focus on data driven instruction and differentiated learning and small groups. Small group instruction will happen daily in classrooms. A para is assigned to each classroom for 30 minutes per day to assist in pulling groups for small group instruction.

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

ZSE's 5th grade math scores increased by 11 percentage points from 20/21 to 20/22.

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

ZSE uses Reflex math to supplement its core math curriculum.

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

ZSE will use the i-Ready tool boxes and FCRR student centers for small group instruction and differentiate accelerated 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.

For the 22-23 school year, ZSE will be providing staff with thinking maps training, the Heartland Education Consortium is partnering with us to provide PD on the new best standards.

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

Teachers will be provided ongoing support by school administration and literacy coach. In weekly PLC's data is reviewed to drive instruction. Best Standards training will continue throughout the school year.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our FSA scores and K,1,2 i-Ready scores declined. 50% of ZSE's SWD subgroup did not show proficiency.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	More than 50% of students in the SWD sub group will improve the equivalent of one grade level.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Lesson plans of ESE support staff will be monitored, classroom walk thrus, data chats monthly, progress monitoring results will be used to drive instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Suzanne Stagg (sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	ZSE will use data to differentiate instruction based on the needs of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Progress monitoring, 21-22 FSA scores, and 22-23 Progress Monitoring.

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.

Professional Development related to lesson planning and effective reading strategies.

Person Responsible	Angella Coleman (acoleman@hardee.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLC's and Data Chats

Person Responsible	Suzanne Stagg (sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us)

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

Grades K-2 have a 30 minute block in addition to their 90 minute reading block for differentiated small group instruction. A para is assigned to each class during their 30 minute block to assist with pulling groups.

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

Grades 3-5 have a 30 minute block in addition to their 90 minute reading block for differentiated small group instruction. A para is assigned to each class during their 30 minute block to assist with pulling groups.

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)

50% of students in grade k,1,2 will score proficient or above on the final FAST assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

50% of students in grades 3,4,5 will score proficient or above on the final APM 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.

Classroom walkthurs, Data chats, Weekly PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Stagg, Suzanne, sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us

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?

Differentiated instruction, small groups daily, book studies for staff PD, Staff PD for effective lesson planning, FCRR student centers.

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?

Daily small group differentiated instruction will help close student achievement gaps.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching-The schools literacy coach will attend weekly PLC's, she will provide PD in small group instruction and model lessons.	Stagg, Suzanne, sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us
Assessment-Formative and informative assessments will be given weekly to evaluate student progress.	Stagg, Suzanne, sstagg@hardee.k12.fl.us

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.

ZSE provides an open house so students have the opportunity to meet their teachers prior to the start of the school year. A student/parent/teacher conference is held for each student during the first six weeks of school. During this conference the expectations and roles of each party are reviewed and the school compact is signed. Data chats are held quarterly between parents, students, and teachers to communicate positive progress and areas of need. Specific dates are set aside for evening conferences to accommodate working parents. Daily correspondence through a planner or binder goes home to be signed by parents and students. Weekly reports go home from classroom teachers discussing current curriculum, homework, and classroom activities. Many teachers have incorporated Class Dojo into their daily correspondence with students and parents. Class Dojo connects teachers with students and parents to build classroom communities. Remind texting correspondence to parents allows ZSE to send messages regarding upcoming events, community events, and school wide messages. ZSE also shares school news and events on the schools Facebook page. A newsletter goes home to parents from school monthly including grade level accomplishments, progress on the school improvement plan, and opportunities to get involved as a parent. An automated phone message system, Edulink, is used to inform parents of upcoming school events or absence of their child. ZSE also solicits feedback from parents on surveys regarding Title 1 and

parent involvement yearly. Parents may contact teachers or administrators with questions. A Title 1 orientation is held in the first month of school to review student achievement data, share Title 1 requirements, and educate parents on their rights to participate in school activities. Bi-monthly parent nights are held to provide valuable information regarding the schools curriculum and exciting learning activities to do at home.

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

ZSE stakeholders include parents,students, community members, teachers and staff, school administrators,district staff and school board members . Parents roles are to attend parent conferences, school events, communicate regularly with their child's teacher and be a positive advocate for their child.Parents take on the role of making sure their students attend school, get a good night's rest, and complete homework assignments. Parents are encouraged to join school committees such as the school advisory council,PTO, attend parent nights, and Title I events to have input in school decisions. Students are expected to attend class, be prepared, complete assignments, and take care of school property. Community members and leaders play a vital role in the culture of a school by supporting school programs monetarily and as volunteers. Teachers and school staff are expected to possess the professional knowledge to lead students in instruction. Teachers and school staff also serve as mentors and supervisors of students during the school day and after school activities. District staff serve schools by offering support with programs, curriculum, and district wide initiatives. The school boards role is fulfill the districts vision and make the best decisions for all students.