

Pasco County Schools

Zephyrhills High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Zephyrhills High School

6335 12TH ST, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

<https://zhs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Christina Stanley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2019-20 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	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 Pasco 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Zephyrhills High School

6335 12TH ST, Zephyrhills, FL 33542

<https://zhs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	62%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Zephyrhills High School is to prepare students to become productive, responsible citizens and lifelong learners. Our vision is that all our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students achieving success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stanley, Christina	Principal	Fine Arts PLC, CTE PLC (Agriculture, JROTC, Health, Criminal Justice, Building Construction Tech, Business), Audits, Booster clubs, Budget, DAP/Expulsions, Custodial, Non-instructional evals, Personnel/Allocations, Staff Handbook, Student Leadership Team, SchoolConnect Messages, SAC, Website/Social Media
Hayes, Matt	Assistant Principal	Grade 10, Science PLC, Athletics, Advanced Placement, Calendar, Clubs/Organizations, Crisis (plans, drills, safety), HERO, ISS, MTSS data cycle, PSAT, Transportation, PBIS
Watkins, Camille	Assistant Principal	9th grade, Social Studies PLC, World Language PLC, PE and Driver's Ed PLC, District Finals, FSA retakes, ESOL/WIDA, Student awards/celebrations/ceremonies, Student/Staff recognition, Title 1, Wellness Committee/FNS, Compassionate Schools Lead, Trauma Informed Care Lead
Yonkof, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	11th grade, Math PLC, CTE Aerospace PLC, ESE/IND PLC, Alt to Suspension, Dual Enrollment, FTE/SESIR/Survey needs, FSAA and waivers, Hospital/Homebound, Master Schedule (9,11), 504/ESE procedures, PERT, SIT
Hochstetler, Tammy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Head, 12th grade class sponsor,
Ellis, Phil	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head
Dawson, Lisa	Teacher, Career/Technical	CTE PLC facilitator
Briggs, Rick	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies PLC facilitator, 11th grade class sponsor, Student Council advisor
Hoskins, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Michelle Hoskins: Math PLC facilitator
Winslett, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Math PLC facilitator
Barrett, Dannielle	Teacher, K-12	Science PLC facilitator
Barrick, Chris	Teacher, K-12	9th grade team leader (Title 1)
Thomas, Bryan	Teacher, K-12	10th grade team leader (Title 1)
Pardo, Kim	Teacher, K-12	11th grade team leader (Title 1), SIT team leader

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hochstetler, Troy	Teacher, K-12	12th grade team leader (Title 1), 9th grade class sponsor
Simons, April	Other	Career Specialist, AVID site lead
Moore, Julie	School Counselor	Student Services lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Christina Stanley

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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

83

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
2019-20 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	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (43%)
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 .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	452	377	368	310	1507
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	114	136	119	472
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4	22
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196	131	135	104	566
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	33	118	82	245

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	310	121	97	113	641

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	
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

Wednesday 9/30/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**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	398	404	351	322	1475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	55	65	57	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	108	126	82	397
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	78	102	76	308
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	154	145	86	506

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	89	118	129	82	418

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**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	398	404	351	322	1475
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	55	65	57	248
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	108	126	82	397
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	78	102	76	308
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	154	145	86	506

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	89	118	129	82	418

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	
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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	57%	56%	39%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	53%	51%	41%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	42%	38%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	42%	56%	51%	44%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	40%	49%	48%	44%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	45%	29%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	53%	70%	68%	53%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	73%	73%	71%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
09	2019	49%	57%	-8%	55%	-6%
	2018	32%	55%	-23%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	37%	53%	-16%	53%	-16%
	2018	38%	55%	-17%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

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
2019	54%	68%	-14%	67%	-13%
2018	55%	65%	-10%	65%	-10%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	62%	69%	-7%	70%	-8%
2018	66%	70%	-4%	68%	-2%
Compare		-4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	37%	60%	-23%	61%	-24%
2018	32%	63%	-31%	62%	-30%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	62%	-21%	57%	-16%
2018	40%	60%	-20%	56%	-16%
Compare		1%			

Subgroup Data

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	30	38	34	31	44	47	35	42		91	18
ELL	16	50	50	17	35					75	
ASN	60			75	60						
BLK	40	51	48	31	40	41	40	50		81	29
HSP	49	55	46	41	36	28	51	55		87	30
MUL	52	65		42	64		65			86	25
WHT	44	44	29	43	40	42	54	68		90	37
FRL	43	48	42	41	41	37	49	61		88	30
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	34	38	13	31	33	31	63		65	20
ELL	12	37	36	17	47					82	
ASN								70			
BLK	23	33	27	29	39		33	56		77	35
HSP	33	39	47	24	37	36	59	51		75	47
MUL	39	48		38	55		50			75	33
WHT	39	40	36	40	51	48	58	78		74	44
FRL	33	39	38	34	44	35	51	67		71	40
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	27	27	18	25	21	27	50		69	12
ELL		50		25						46	
ASN	55			50							
BLK	25	37	45	31	43	31	48	44		67	6
HSP	31	34	36	38	49	38	36	48		60	45
MUL	36	36		27	36			82		92	45
WHT	43	43	38	47	44	27	58	79		78	42
FRL	33	38	38	40	44	30	48	66		70	35

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
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	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	65
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	45
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	47

Hispanic Students	
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	57
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	49
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Comparing School Grade Components, ZHS saw low performance from 2018 to 2019 in the following areas: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile, Math Learning Gains, Math Lowest 25th Percentile, Social Studies Achievement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Math Learning Gains dropped by 7%. We had several Math classes that had inconsistent instruction due to teachers leaving.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Science achievement dropped from 56% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. State average was 67% in 2018 and 68% in 2019.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA Learning Gains grew from 40% in 2018 to 49% in 2019. There was an intentional focus on writing and revision schoolwide.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Student attendance and students' passing the required assessments (ELA, Algebra, etc.)

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Improving ESOL students performance on the federal index to above 41% in English Language Proficiency
2. Improving student attendance and absence tracking
3. Improving student achievement in ELA/Math lowest 25th percentiles and ELA/Math Learning gains
4. Reducing student course failures in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies
5. Reducing student suspensions and celebrating student positive behaviors

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: This area of focus includes improving ESOL students' performance on the federal index to above 41% in English Language Proficiency, improving student achievement in ELA lowest 25th percentile and ELA Learning gains, and reducing student course failures in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: Outcome 1: ESOL students will improve to above 41% in ELA on the federal index. This outcome will also have direct and specific implications on the ELA lowest 25th percentile, ELA learning gains, and reducing student course failures in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Camille Watkins (cwatkins@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: ESOL IA will push in to classes to provide support, utilize a pull-out model when appropriate, and will collaborate with ELA, Reading, and Social Studies teachers regarding instructional strategies for student success. ELA Instructional Coach will provide support to teachers and lesson modeling designed to support student collaboration and voice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our ESOL IA has a case load and will collaborate with ELA, Reading, and Social Studies staff to support students. Teachers benefit from coaching and support.

Action Steps to Implement

*ESOL IA will push in to ELA, Reading, and Social Studies classes.

*ESOL IA and AP over ELA will collaborate to create parent nights designed to target how parents can support student achievement.

*ELA Instructional Coach and AP will collaborate to provide support to teachers and review student data in the PLC using the assessment cycle.

Person Responsible Camille Watkins (cwatkins@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus includes improving student achievement in Math lowest 25th percentile and Math Learning gains, and reducing student course failures in Math
Measurable Outcome:	Outcome 1: Students will improve to above 41% in Math Learning Gains on the school grade component. This outcome will also have direct and specific implications on the Math lowest 25th percentile and reducing student course failures in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Yonkof (jingerso@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math Instructional Coach will provide modeling of lesson design and delivery, specific coaching support for teachers, integration of AVID collaboration strategies, and direct support.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers benefit from support in delivery of content and different ways to try to reach students.

Action Steps to Implement

*Math coach will push in to classes.

*Math coach and teachers will collaborate in PLC using student data and the PLC assessment cycle to create and implement lessons targeted to what students need.

Person Responsible Jennifer Yonkof (jingerso@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Class and campus walkthroughs, teachers provided coaching support, student/family follow up on graduation requirements/assessments/grades, targeted focus in the PLC on use of data and the assessment cycle.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Students are involved through Student Council and club opportunities to create a positive school culture through activities, community volunteer days, and positive behavior reinforcement. Students have a voice in the School Advisory Council, running Pep Rallies (and more), and creating a positive social media presence.

Teachers and staff are involved through the Celebration Committee (and various other committees such as Equal Opportunity Schools, AVID, etc.), School Advisory Council, Social Emotional Learning opportunities, and giving students HERO points. Our mission and vision align to make support for each other and the students our primary focus.

Our community members, parents, and businesses are involved in building a positive school culture and environment through School Advisory Council, community celebrations of our students (parades, banquets, Rotary recognition, etc.), and donations of food, items, and financial support.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00