Sunset Hills Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sunset Hills Elementary School

1347 GULF RD, Tarpon Springs, FL 34689

http://www.sunsethills-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Johnnie Crawford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/5/2017

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)	42%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (75%) 2020-21: (69%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Pinellas 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of Sunset Hills Elementary School is to provide a caring environment where families, students and staff learn together to ensure all students are prepared for college, career and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide a collaborative and equitable learning environment ensuring 100% student success

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Abrahamson, Darren	Guidance Counselor	
Bone, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	
Crawford III, Johnnie	Principal	
Esposito, Kristen	Instructional Media	
Gonzalez, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	
Miller, Shelly	Teacher, K-12	
Potter, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Moore, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Price, Teresa	Assistant Principal	
Wendler, Sracey	Teacher, ESE	
Hume-Marston, Sandra	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/5/2017, Johnnie Crawford

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.*
4

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
31

Total number of students enrolled at the school

476

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

1

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

1

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	71	85	91	83	70	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	480
Attendance below 90 percent	22	20	24	24	30	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	8	17	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	16	18	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	14	13	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	29	86	75	8	63	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	328
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	11	15	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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		
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	29	86	75	8	63	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	328
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	11	15	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	68%			68%			65%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	79%			70%			61%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%			43%			37%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	75%			70%			71%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	85%			86%			70%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%			71%			53%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	84%			75%			65%	53%	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	66%	56%	10%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	66%	56%	10%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	54%	8%	56%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	72%	62%	10%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					
	2019	80%	60%	20%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	66%	54%	12%	53%	13%
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	43	82	85	43	76	73					
ELL											
BLK	30			50							
HSP	65	73		70	81						
MUL	58	70		91							
WHT	71	83	80	76	87	64	84				
FRL	57	71	68	68	82	67	71				

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	19	45		35	70		25				
HSP	70			83			60				
MUL	85			67							
WHT	67	69		69	87	80	77				
FRL	58	62		59	76	70	63				

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	19	25	21	23	55	53	10				
ELL	29	33	36	48	48	33	18				
BLK	50			73							
HSP	63	58		68	74						
MUL	75			83							
WHT	65	61	41	71	70	48	65				
FRL	51	52	31	65	64	55	60				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	603
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	67
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	80
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	40
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	72
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	78
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	69
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 grade has declined in both Math(-2) and ELA(-8)
-4th grade is on the incline and has passed pre-pandemic levels in math and is close in ELA (+8)
-5th grade has maintained an 84 in math and and passed pre-pandemic levels in ELA
SWD- ELA 3rd -45% proficient, 4th -38% proficient, 5th -78% proficient, Math 3rd- 55% proficient, 4th-44% proficient, 5th- 67% proficient, Science- 78% proficient
ELL-ELA 3rd -50% proficient, 4th -50% proficient, 5th -50% proficient, Math 3rd- 50% proficient, 4th-50% proficient, 5th- 50% proficient, Science- 50% proficient.

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

3rd grade- Decreased by -2% since pre-pandemic in math and by- 8% in ELA
SWD federal index score fell from 39 to 29
BLK students identified in focus were 36% proficient in ELA

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

Third grade historically has been a difficult transition year. This is the schools largest co-hort of students and could contribute to the differential. The grade level team will have some changes on the team and will need to focus on teaching the B.E.S.T. standards with depth. Teacher professional development in the areas of questioning and specific feedback will be focuses. Data meetings will dig into the most missed standards and each students understanding of those standards.

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

5th grade had the most improvements in science and 4th grade had an 8% gain in math.

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

4th and 5th grade are strong teams that collaborate and are experienced with the current standards. Students also have less of a transition as far as learning objective and depth of learning from 3rd to 4th and 4th to 5th.

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

3rd grade will need to jump into the depth of the 3rd grade standards with timely formative assessments to monitor the needs of the students and make instructional shifts as needed.

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.

The district provides ongoing content and teaching methodology training in person and virtually. Teachers will identify the areas of focus and tailor a professional development plan to the class needs. Teachers will also use Professional Learning Community time to collaborate on best practices and what is working within the classroom.

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

Intentional data driven meeting agendas for each grade level on a monthly basis. Conversations about struggling students or teachers struggling with teacher specific standards. Using instructional coaches to examine the depth of instruction of the standards and the differentiation in the classroom.

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.	Based on the 2021-2022 FSA data SHES shows a critical need to move students scoring a 1 or 2 in ELA(99 students), Math(80 students) and Science(18 students) and based on classroom observations teachers need to increase higher level questioning and giving specific feedback.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	SHES will decrease the number of students scoring a level 1 or 2 on the state assessment by 10% in each content area (ELA- 10 students, Math- 8 students, Science- 2 students), increase higher level questioning and specific feedback for all students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	All content areas will be monitored by interim and formative and summative assessments and informal observations of questioning and feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implementing the new B.E.S.T. standards, data discussions in professional learning communities plc's, and intentional professional development based on the needs of the teacher and students. PLC's will determine the standards most missed on the FSA assessment by grade level and content area and plan learning targets will explicit instruction and use scaffolding for targeted students. Students will be involved in what they are learning and what the goal of the learning is. For Science: 1. Ensure students have opportunity to complete all components of science labs. 2. Utilize the 5 E Instructional model, inclusive of explicit and modeled instruction, guided practice with teacher support and feedback and opportunities for individual practice. 3. Implementation monitoring of the science lab through walk-throughs and pre/post tests. 4. The use of diagnostic and cycle data to inform academic vocabulary gaming and 3rd/4th review plan. 5. Provide professional development for purposeful activation and transfer strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	For students who did not score a level 1 or 2 on the FSA, tier 1 instruction needs to be differentiated based on the area the students are not experiencing success. Additional resources and strategies such as scaffolding, small group instruction and peer assistance will be implemented.

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.

School administration, district resources and teachers will use data to determine the individual students and the standards to focus on. School administration and teachers will provide intentional professional development to support the standards that need to be reinforced.

Person Responsible

Teresa Price (pricete@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the 2021-2022 FSA scores, 36 % of African-American students were proficient in ELA, 55% of student were proficient in Math, and 67% of students were proficient in Science.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	African- American students scoring proficient in ELA will increase by 25% on the summative state assessment for the school year 2022-2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	School, grade level and class level data will be monitored through out the school year for African-American students in the areas of grades, attendance and formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Johnnie Crawford III (crawfordjo@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	SHES will use student data trackers to assist African-American students in knowing their learning targets and progress during the year for ELA, Math and Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Student involvement in instructional progress is key to ownership and engagement. Students will be given a data tracker to keep track of their grades, attendance and formative assessments. Students will make goals for ELA, Math and Science to compare their progress to their goals throughout the school year.

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.

Administration will create or adjust the student data tracker. Teachers will assist students in filling out their data trackers throughout the year. The student data trackers will also be used during student lead conferences.

Person Responsible	Teresa Price (pricete@pcsb.org)

#3. 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.**	Based on the the Federal Index score, SHES decreased from 39 to 29 in 2021-2022 and 4th grade SWD, ELA proficiency was 38%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	SHES will increase the Federal Index score for SWD to 41 in 2022-2023 school year and increase the proficiency for 5th grade students with disabilities to 50%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Monitor Dreambox, iStation and, biweekly progress monitoring data to ensure growth is occurring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Our primary strategies will be Collaborative Planning and the use of the push-in model. ESE and General Education teachers will work closely to meet the needs of the students they have in common. The administration will ensure there is time to analyze student work and performance data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	According to Marzano's Focus Model, Collaboration is a professional responsibility and significantly increases the rate of student success. In addition, by pushing in, ESE teachers can ensure students are able to process new content, practice skills, strategies, and processes as they access grade-level content.

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.

For Core content:
1. Implement a process for placing students requiring ESE services in master schedules first in order to optimize service delivery and focused on a clustering process to meet student needs.
2. Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.
3. Embed metagcognitive strategies into content based instruction to teach students critical memory and engagement processes they can use to access, retain, and generalize important content.
4. Make rigorous texts, materials, content, and activities accessible to students through supplementary aids including annotated texts and assistive technology.
5. Collect and interpret data from Dreambox, Station, and objectives to drive instruction based on student accommodations and interventions.
For Science
1. Ensure students have opportunity to complete all components of science labs.
2. Utilize the 5 E Instructional model, inclusive of explicit and modeled instruction, guided practice with teacher support and feedback and opportunities for individual practice.
3. Implementation monitoring of the science lab through walk-throughs and pre/post tests.

4. The use of diagnostic and cycle data to inform academic vocabulary gaming and 3rd/4th review plan.
5. Provide professional development for purposeful activation and transfer strategies.

Person Responsible   Teresa Price (pricete@pcsb.org)

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 and maintaining a positive culture and environment starts with our administration. As a neighborhood school, we value the support of our entire community. We have and will continue to partner with the City of Tarpon on various events and activities such as our Color Run and Lambatha. Our SAC and PTA give stakeholders access to school leadership opportunities to provide feedback and monitor school progress towards the goals identified in our school improvement plan. This year we plan to use technology and various meeting platforms to expand stakeholder access as well as increase communication with our parents and the community.

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

Administration: Establishes positive relationships with stakeholders that result in
productive support and accomplishment of the school's goals. Positive and
productive relationships are achieved by engaging in two-way or multiparty communications, active
listening, giving encouragement and support, setting clear goals and expectations,
explaining the "why" of goals and related tasks, providing feedback to stakeholders, and coaching to help
stakeholders to be their best.

Teachers: create a positive classroom environment by starting the year with
high expectations, encouraging student involvement, making the classroom visually appealing,
getting parents involved, and using effective praise and effective feedback.

PBIS Team-Team will work on establishing routines and processes for effectively teaching appropriate behavior to all students, intervening prior to behaviors escalating and monitoring all progress. This will help establish a safe environment where stakeholders are heard and have a voice.

Community Liaison-Will work on building relationships with the community that support all stakeholders. Secures supports from volunteers and community to create a safe and effective learning environment.

School Guidance Counselor -Provide guidance lessons to whole class and individual students. Maintains the MTSS process ensuring that all students receive specific accommodations and interventions necessary to improve academic and behavior process.

Parent Teacher Association (PTA)-Assist with programs that enhance and empower students and families in the community to build a safe environment where all stakeholders have a voice and are heard.

Students: Encourage and celebrate the academic achievement of other students during grade level rallies, class celebrations and, the morning news show. In addition, students host a morning news show that reinforces good character traits and school expectations.