Pinellas County Schools

Cypress Woods Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 5

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 12

Positive Culture & Environment 0

Budget to Support Goals 0

Cypress Woods Elementary School

4900 CYPRESS WOODS BLVD, Palm Harbor, FL 34685

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

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Hill

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	21%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students 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 (79%) 2020-21: (77%) 2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (71%)
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 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.

Teach It! Learn It! Live It!

Provide the school's vision statement.

To achieve Cypress Woods Elementary's vision, we will prepare our students to become independent learners with the desires, the skills, and the abilities necessary for lifelong learning. This will require creating a learning environment which is centered around students, directed by teachers, and supported by home and community.

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
Hill, Kim	Principal	
Stevens, Christopher	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Kimberly Hill

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

Total number of students enrolled at the school
725

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.
2

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	89	106	95	117	126	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	632
Attendance below 90 percent	0	21	10	14	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	0	1	0	1	1	1	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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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 6/20/2022

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	87	92	121	126	111	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	9	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	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	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	87	92	121	126	111	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	0	7	9	8	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	0	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	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	83%			83%			80%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	72%			73%			72%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%			72%			63%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	87%			86%			83%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%			75%			76%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	82%			63%			59%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	86%			87%			76%	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	84%	56%	28%	58%	26%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	81%	56%	25%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	76%	54%	22%	56%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

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	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					
	2019	78%	60%	18%	60%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	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	50	57	39	66	83	88	58				
ELL	64			71							
ASN	70			70							
HSP	76	72		83	83	90	82				
MUL	81			81							
WHT	85	71	63	89	79	82	86				
FRL	67	73	68	73	73	59	55				

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	49	69		60	62		54				
ELL	55			58							
ASN	70			80							
BLK	50			60							
HSP	82	69		77	69		86				
WHT	86	73	76	89	77	67	90				
FRL	67	67		82	67		73				

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	47	56	53	57	59	65	39				
ELL	83	73		92	73						
ASN	85			85							
BLK	55			64							
HSP	78	80		78	73	40	79				
MUL	82	67		76	75						
WHT	81	72	63	85	77	64	76				
FRL	64	71	60	78	71	60	59				

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	79
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	630
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	63
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	71
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	70
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	
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	81
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	81
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	79
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	67
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?

The rate of proficiency across all grade levels, on their final progress monitoring cycle is 74% for ELA and 78% for Math. On MAP progress monitoring, 2/5 grade levels showed improvement over all cycles of assessments for ELA and 0/5 grade levels show improvement on Math. There was an observed decline in progress monitoring data from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022. FSA ELA proficiency rose from 83% in 2021 to 84% in 2022 and FSA Math proficiency rose from 86% in 2021 to 88% in 2022. There were gains made to overall proficiency in FSA ELA and Math.

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

Based off progress monitoring (NWEA MAP) and 2022 state assessments (FSA), the greatest opportunity for growth is in ELA. ELA proficiency across grades 3-5 on FSA was 84%. ELA learning gains were down 1% from 73% to 72% as measures on the 2022 FSA ELA assessments.

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 lack of student growth, especially in our subgroup data on progress monitoring (NWEA MAP) and state assessments (FSA), show the need for intentional focus on differentiated instruction through PLC work, professional development and teacher planning. The focus this school year will be placed on intention work between teachers, staff and administration; with an emphasis on data analysis and instructional strategies for differentiation. The school-wide professional development calendar and grade level PLC suggested topics will include strategies for differentiation. Walkthroughs and observations will include discussions on opportunities and areas of growth for differentiation practices. School administration will suggest teacher deliberate practice plans focus on differentiation of instruction.

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

Based off progress monitoring (NWEA MAP) and 2022 state assessments (FSA), the greatest area of growth was in Math. Overall proficiency for grades 3-5 on FSA Math rose from 86% to 88%. Math learning gains increased 4% from 75% to 79% as measures on the 2022 FSA math assessments. Our school's 4th grade students scored a 95% on overall proficiency.

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

Based off of progress monitoring (NWEA MAP) and 2022 state assessments (FSA), the most improvement was shown in overall learning gains. The increase in learning gains for all students increased by 4%. Overall proficiency in math rose 2% from 86% to 88%, as measures on FSA math.

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

Strategies that will be implemented to accelerate learning will be focused ELP groups for both intervention and enrichment. Our school will implement LLI groups to increase reading fluency for struggling students. Just in time coaching will be brought in for areas of concern for both instruction and interventions.

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.

Professional development opportunities will include focused grade level PLCs, trainings from ISDs for content areas, consulting with ESOL district staff for EL resources, and trainings with our district vendors (including Dreambox liaison/McGraw Hill/ELA Department).

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

School administration will:
•Monitor grade level PLCs
•Provide trainings on content area instruction and assessments
•Attend trainings with staff members on site for better understanding of resources and practices needed for implementation
•Attend training for a deeper understanding of new B.E.S.T. standards and the state assessments/ progress monitoring - F.A.S.T.

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.	Progress Monitoring data (NWEA Map, FSA, Common Assessments) from the 2021-22 school year show The rate of proficiency is 74% for ELA and 78% for Math. FSA ELA proficiency rose from 83% in 2021 to 84% in 2022 and FSA Math proficiency rose from 86% in 2021 to 88% in 2022. On MAP progress monitoring, 2/5 grade levels showed growth over all cycles of assessments for ELA and 0/5 grade levels show growth on Math. This data shows a need for differentiation to show student growth in ELA and Math.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Proficiency in Science will increase 4% from 86% to 90%, as measured by Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Assessment. Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 5% from 83% (on FSA) to 88%, as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment. Proficiency in Mathematics will increase 5% from 87% (on FSA) to 92%, as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment. Black student proficiency in ELA and Math will increase 10% from 60% (on FSA) to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The area of focus will be monitored by our progress monitoring data (including sub group data) with grade level and cross grade level PLCs and Data Chats. This area will also be monitored during administrative walk-throughs and feedback conferences.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Utilize curricular materials to create differentiated learning tasks that are standards-aligned and rigorous to meet the unique needs of all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Classrooms are filled with diverse learners with unique needs and learning styles. A traditional “one size fits all” approach will not be effective for many of our students; for creating growth. Good instruction should include a variety of researched based strategies. Instruction should include multimodal and when appropriate real-world tasks. This approach will raise student engagement and growth.

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.

• Expect teachers to intentionally plan for differentiation (using formative assessment/observation data) for all learners
• Differentiate for all learners by moving beyond just adapting content, product and process to include thinking skills (asking questions, making plans, organizing and creating information)
• School wide PD will focus on differentiation strategies (i.e. UDL, voice and choice, etc)
• Administrators recommend that Deliberate Practice Plans incorporate opportunities for growth in the area of differentiation
• Monitor academic growth and action plan for scaffolded support or enrichment as needed (for all students/classrooms)

Person Responsible Kim Hill (hillki@pcsb.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our current discipline data includes 14 total referrals (11 students), and 107 Family Communication Forms. We expect the number of referrals to decrease by May 2023. In the past two years we have seen a need to intentionally teach students strategies for social and emotional development in the classroom. This involves teaching and modeling social and emotional skills, providing opportunities for students to practice and hone those skills, and giving students an opportunity to apply these skills in various situations.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The number of students receiving referrals will decrease by 1% as measured by discipline data in Focus by May 2023. All classrooms will use Harmony SEL and Restorative Practices to build positive classroom culture.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Goal will be monitored by: - Administration during visits to classrooms during Harmony lessons - SBLT reviewing discipline and PBIS data monthly - PLC minutes on SEL and PBIS lessons used in grade levels - Participation in school-wide PD related to PBIS/SEL
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Stevens (stevensch@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	If we focus on intentional planning of SEL strategies in our daily classroom routines, we will not only provide students a foundation for safe and positive learning, but also and enhances their ability to succeed in school, academically and behaviorally. Teaching SEL strategies also establishes and maintains positive relationships with all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Research shows that SEL not only improves achievement by an average of 11 percentile points, but it also increases prosocial behaviors (such as kindness, sharing, and empathy), improves student attitudes toward school, and reduces depression and stress among students. Effective social and emotional learning programming involves coordinated classroom, schoolwide, family, and community practices that help students develop self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, relationships, and responsible decision making.

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.

• All staff to complete Harmony SEL training provided by school psychologist
• Classroom teachers will implement Harmony lessons (Meet Up and/or Buddy Up) at least 3 times a week
• All K-5 classrooms participate in guidance lessons 3-4 times a year. Lesson topics will be collaboratively decided between teacher and school counselor
• A minimum of 2 parent focus group/meet up trainings conducted to provide families with resources and strategies in the area of social emotional learning. Trainings will be facilitated by administration and student service team.
• All classrooms expected to follow school wide PBIS plan and align classroom management plan to Guidelines for Success (SOAR)
• Classroom Management Plans will focus on positive reinforcement (Re: Ditch the Clip article)

Person Responsible Christopher Stevens (stevensch@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.

Building and maintaining a positive school culture for the 2022-23 school year will continue to be high priority. Through our annual climate survey we are able to assess areas of strengths and areas needed for growth based on the feedback. This feedback is shared with our staff, School Advisory Council, and PTA to develop a plan for addressing needs and enhancing our strengths. Several events are scheduled to be held throughout the year to connect with our stakeholders, which include - Meet the Teacher, Open House, School-wide Enrichment Model (SEM) Showcase, Curriculum Showcases, PTA events, and volunteer orientation.

We intend to offer some of our school-wide events on multiple platforms throughout the school year in order to maintain connection to our stakeholders. We use communication platforms such as school newsletters, social media, school website, and school messenger to ensure that our stakeholders are made aware of school operations concerning academic achievement, school safety, upcoming learning opportunities, community partnerships, and pertinent/timely information. As leaders, the Principal and Assistant Principal are accessible to students, staff, families, and the community.

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

Team Leaders - Provide feedback to school's administration on school-wide processes and procedures, academic needs and behavior needs.
SBLT - Monitor student academic and behavior data, provide student service support, support

socialemotional learning, evaluate students if needed
SAC - Provide feedback and support to school through School Improvement Plan
PTA - Support/planning school-wide initiatives, classroom partnerships, provides feedback to teachers/ admin
Business Partners - Lunch Pal mentors, reward incentives for students, sponsor of curriculum nights
Early Childhood Providers - collaboration and transition for our preschool families
Middle School Feeder Schools - collaboration and transition for our fifth grade families