

Martin County School District

Jensen Beach High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jensen Beach High School

2875 NW GOLDENROD RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

martinschools.org/o/jbhs

Demographics

Principal: Lori Vogel

Start Date for this Principal: 6/16/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	37%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jensen Beach High School

2875 NW GOLDENROD RD, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

martinschools.org/o/jbhs

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>37%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>36%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Empowering All Students for Success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A Collaborative Community Committed to 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
Vogel, Lori	Principal	
Reese, Stacy	Assistant Principal	
Connolly, Andrew	Assistant Principal	
Hockensmith , Alyssa	Teacher, K-12	
Gucciardo, Mary	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/16/2022, Lori Vogel

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

76

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,603

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

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

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	465	378	367	376	1586
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	88	100	118	403
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	1	2	17
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	10	10	31
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	21	19	67
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	63	46	29	254
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	69	21	15	207
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	55	0	0	146
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	49	38	31	170

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/16/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364	370	372	401	1507
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	47	55	62	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	15	7	7	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	14	7	5	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	12	1	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	33	30	7	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	61	33	8	153
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	33	30	7	111

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	53	53	35	11	152

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	4	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364	370	372	401	1507
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	47	55	62	222
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	15	7	7	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	14	7	5	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	27	12	1	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	33	30	7	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	61	33	8	153
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	33	30	7	111

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	53	53	35	11	152

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	4	9

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	64%	57%	51%				72%	71%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						61%	59%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						50%	55%	42%
Math Achievement	60%	41%	38%				70%	69%	51%
Math Learning Gains	55%						48%	52%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						47%	46%	45%
Science Achievement	70%	44%	40%				84%	82%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	47%	48%				87%	84%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	74%	11%	67%	18%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	87%	78%	9%	70%	17%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	75%	-3%	61%	11%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	65%	4%	57%	12%

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	30	38	30	40	45	39	28	50		98	33
ELL	19	24	11	61	65		67			94	29
ASN	73	55									
BLK	33	45	37	49	55	33	50	50		93	23
HSP	52	45	17	66	63	50	64	79		97	61
MUL	59	65		67	67			73		100	53
WHT	70	62	49	59	52	40	72	87		99	70
FRL	47	51	35	55	53	47	59	66		95	50
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	32	30	26	23	38	28	55	46		93	25
ELL	36	47	38	23	31		50	36		73	27

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
ASN	86	82									
BLK	46	50	35	21	37	43	57	40		97	14
HSP	66	65	39	42	32	10	70	75		89	59
MUL	81	69		47	38		73				
WHT	74	59	53	59	33	43	85	78		96	63
FRL	55	55	44	40	40	38	67	62		93	44

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	37	43	36	41	45	37	58	70		85	29
ELL	38	64	73	52	61					60	42
BLK	48	44	39	47	50	50	48	77		85	31
HSP	70	65	65	71	45	43	80	83		83	48
MUL	74	57		45	41		75			100	47
WHT	74	63	51	74	49	48	89	89		95	71
FRL	60	57	48	63	51	46	77	80		86	46

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	65
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	76
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	712
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	50
---	----

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	64
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	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	69
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	66
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	58
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?

Areas of concern are in ELA, Science, and Social Studies with an overall downturn in performance compared to 2021 data. Area of strength is Mathematics with an overall upturn in major and subgroup categories.

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

Losses in all subgroups for ELA, Science and Social Studies are most concerning in that it represents and overall lack of growth across the board.

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

This year's enrollment data with larger numbers of subgroups in lower performing subgroups identify the need for greater interventions and monitoring targeted to specific subgroups.

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

Math showed an overall improvement, but we have since changed course progression and instructional materials for SY 2023 so that is a cause of concern.

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

We will need to adjust to the new instructional materials.

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

We will need to incorporate targeted interventions based on the unique needs of the subgroups to monitor and performance and remediate as necessary.

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 will need to focus on content-based ELL strategies, as well as engagement strategies to support the teachers

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

We will be implementing flexible scheduling for ELL's with language support para professionals, Imagine Math, and data-focused planning sessions.

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 Hispanic

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Overall ELA achievement for ELL dropped from 36% in 2021 to 19% in 2022 with an overall achievement gap of 45 achievement points.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students outcome will be expected to close the achievement gap between the ELL students and the overall performance.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will be through Progress Monitoring Tests. Instruction will be adjusted through data-based decision making in the PLC groups and on an individual level.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The PLC will monitor student growth using our aligned aligned curriculum. Students with lagging performance will be pulled for small group instruction with ELL support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will monitor if the students are making learning gains through the implementation and instruction of the curriculum and will implement tiered interventions to increase learning.

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.

1. Teach using verified curriculum
2. Progress Monitor via FAST data and Lexia
3. Implement small group intervention

Person Responsible

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have a larger portion of our incoming students with level 1 math scores that we need to address so that the students learning progresses so that they are able to pass the graduation requirements for courses and standardized tests in Math.

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

We plan to achieve proficiency rates in Algebra testing of:
 65% achievement
 60% learning gains
 47% L25

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

We will monitor this area with two progress monitoring tests, as well as unit assessments that are aligned in each course

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

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

We are implementing a new, aligned curriculum based on our most recent textbook adoption.

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

We selected materials that can support the students in learning to the level of the standards for the course, and believe an aligned, coordinated implementation of that mater will yield the achievement results we are anticipating.

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.

The actions steps that we will take:

1. Implement new curriculum
2. Progress Monitor with PMTs
3. Instructional Planning- CLTs
4. Intervention Resources: afterschool remediation, ESOL support

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. 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.

44% of the Class of 2026 are coming into our school with below proficient reading levels. We are would like to implement strategies to create a 5% growth in the FAST Reading end of year testing data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The data will be based on 2021-22 data of FSA Reading proficiency as compared to 2022-23 FAST reading data. We plan to achieve a 5% increase for the students in the class of 2026.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring testing will be used to monitor the student progress twice previous to the FAST assessment. Level 1 students are also assessed on their progress utilizing the reading program lexile. In addition students will take 6 unit tests that the teachers will use the performance data for planning and remediation instruction developed utilizing the Professional Learning Community process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Vogel (vogell@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

We are utilizing a viable curriculum and materials as adopted by our district, state created progress monitoring assessments, as well as collaborative discussion and planning in PLC's.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

We wanted to utilize curriculum and assessments that will provide us accurate data to utilize to plan instruction and interventions so we have a clear understanding of the students' progress towards proficiency, and we can use collaborative discussion to have best practices implemented equitably to all our students.

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.

1. Implement viable curriculum with fidelity
2. Monitor student progress using multiple assessments
3. Collaborative planning for instruction and intervention
4. Provide students support through tier interventions to meet the improvement goals.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Jensen Beach High Schools is a Gold Model PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) school for the 2022-23 school year. Our PBIS committee works closely with students, parents, staff and community members to provide opportunities for our students and staff members to be recognized for promoting a positive school climate. discipline data is examined monthly by our Core PBIS Team to ensure equitable disciplinary outcomes for all students on campus. Intensive, targeted interventions are implemented based on students' needs and are monitored for fidelity.

The Safe School Ambassadors Program is a continuing program at Jensen Beach High School and is an evidence-based program that harnesses the power of students to prevent and stop bullying and mistreatment. It is considered a social-emotional learning program which outside stakeholders from Impact Associates have come to train our staff and students on how to facilitate positive change. Social emotional learning is embedded into our weekly schedule through community building activities created by student

services.

The Literacy Leadership Team continues to develop a multi-tiered system of supports for literacy growth and achievement. The focus for the team will be to develop short and long-term goals for the school, as well as, creating the school-wide system of supports.

Jensen Beach holds school-based information sessions for each grade level, as well as college Financial Planning and local scholarship information sessions each year. This year utilizing the Peer Forward program to increase our school's completion % for the FAFSA. We also hold information sessions for stakeholders with Indian River State College to ensure that we communicate information through multiple outlets including our website and social media.

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

Along with the Administration Team, leading teachers are identified and promoted to positions of leadership within the school. As mentioned above, the LLT has been developed to give leading teachers an increased voice in school-wide community building. The administrative team believes that inviting teachers to participate in leadership teams and school initiatives help to invest in those teachers into school outcomes. Additionally, administrative leaders actively search for invested parents and community members to participate in school programs and committees.