Volusia County Schools

Silver Sands Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/silversandsmiddle/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Rick Inge

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	99%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	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 Volusia 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

Silver Sands Middle School

1300 HERBERT ST, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/silversandsmiddle/pages/default.aspx

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	70%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Silver Sands is committed to building individual character and achievement by linking learning to life through real world applications.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Silver Sands Middle School follows the vision statement of Volusia County Schools. Ensuring all students receive a superior 21st century education.

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
Lavallee, Sharon	Principal	Oversee professional development and monitoring of data
Carignan, Tim	Dean	Discipline
Jones, Jessica	Instructional Media	Development of School Improvement Plan
Mitchell, LaTonya	Assistant Principal	Overseeing professional development and monitoring of data
Leathead, Todd	Assistant Principal	Overseeing professional development and monitoring of data
Alves, Aaron	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/24/2020, Rick Inge

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
75

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	99%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
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	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	378	372	362	0	0	0	0	1112
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	2	9	8	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	66	66	0	0	0	0	195
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	79	61	0	0	0	0	215

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	39	56	39	0	0	0	0	134

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/24/2020

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	499	426	419	0	0	0	0	1344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	69	65	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	9	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	104	112	0	0	0	0	348

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	41	37	34	0	0	0	0	112

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	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
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	499	426	419	0	0	0	0	1344
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	69	65	0	0	0	0	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	10	9	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	104	112	0	0	0	0	348

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	41	37	34	0	0	0	0	112

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	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
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	58%	51%	54%	59%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	51%	54%	59%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	42%	47%	39%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	66%	54%	58%	60%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	57%	51%	57%	59%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	42%	51%	48%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	58%	51%	70%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	71%	72%	77%	71%	70%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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**
06	2019	56%	50%	6%	54%	2%
	2018	56%	48%	8%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	47%	7%	52%	2%
	2018	56%	47%	9%	51%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	58%	48%	10%	55%	3%
	2018	59%	49%	10%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	63%	47%	16%	54%	9%
	2018	57%	44%	13%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	45%	29%	16%	46%	-1%
	2018	45%	37%	8%	45%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	63%	57%	6%	48%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	65%	60%	5%	50%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	68%	11%	71%	8%
2018	74%	66%	8%	71%	3%
Compare		5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	54%	42%	61%	35%
2018	89%	57%	32%	62%	27%
Compare		7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	55%	45%	57%	43%
2018	97%	55%	42%	56%	41%
Compare		3%			

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	22	40	38	30	42	36	30	51	29		
ELL	27	50	47	47	59	63	20	80			

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
ASN	71	65		88	63			100	100		
BLK	37	48	51	46	50	43	33	67	89		
HSP	53	56	50	59	66	65	59	68	79		
MUL	52	54	38	55	49	50	69	77	82		
WHT	62	57	48	70	58	54	70	84	80		
FRL	50	51	40	60	54	51	58	74	76		

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	21	45	44	35	54	44	33	54			
ELL	20	35	27	20	42	40					
ASN	85	82		88	81		100		93		
BLK	41	58	56	42	53	46	40	61	84		
HSP	55	59	52	48	49	38	55	64	73		
MUL	60	50	38	60	57	23	84	69	89		
WHT	60	57	45	66	62	55	71	78	76		
FRL	52	55	46	55	59	48	60	70	70		

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	13	34	31	16	41	41	31	40			
ELL	18	50	40	27	43						
ASN	86	78		79	78		77	100	83		
BLK	34	40	32	34	43	47	52	57	73		
HSP	58	65	33	56	61	54	71	77	70		
MUL	65	75	77	58	62	43	74	89	76		
WHT	62	59	39	64	60	48	72	78	77		
FRL	50	54	38	52	54	44	62	70	61		

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	62
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	618
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	81
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	52
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	62
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	58
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	65
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	57
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.

Proficiency of students with disabilities in Math and ELA. We feel this is due to discipline and attendance within this population. Students are consistently repeat offenders who are out of class in in school or out of school suspension.

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

Learning gains in ELA decreased due to lack of consistent rigorous instruction.

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.

Learning gains in ELA decreased due to lack of consistent rigorous instruction.

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

Social studies showed a growth of 7% from the previous year. Students who were not proficient were identified based on district scores and participated in a remediation course.

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

Discipline

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

1. Discipline
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Math proficiency
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student proficiency for SWD. Les than 1/3 of our students are with disabilities are proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency from 30% - 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher to student feedback
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to Jim Hattie (Visible Learning for Teachers) if students receive direct feedback on their writing they will become more successful in their abilities as well as self evaluation.

Action Steps to Implement	
Professional development - ELA PLC - effective feedback in writing	
Person Responsible	Aaron Alves (ajalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Have teachers review info and develop action plan with Academic Coach/district curriculum specialist	
Person Responsible	Cindy Circelli (cecircel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Plan needs for each grade level	
Person Responsible	Cindy Circelli (cecircel@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Have teachers implement	
Person Responsible	Aaron Alves (ajalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Monitor through walk-thrus	
Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Review results every 2 weeks in PLC meetings	
Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Adjust as needed	
Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Creating a positive culture and environment for students and staff by implements restorative practices. This is based on the increase in referrals and frequent offenders Silver Sands saw in the 2019 - 2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	Referals will decrease by at least 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Carignan (tjcarign@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Restorative practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If students are surrounded by a more positive culture, they will be less likely to receive referrals. Teachers who understand how to deal with discipline issues will be less likely to write referrals.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Restorative practices training.

Person Responsible	Tim Carignan (tjcarign@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Grade level team meetings during preplanning

Person Responsible	Aaron Alves (ajalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Behavioral Leadership Team meetings create positive behavior interventions.

Person Responsible	Cindy Circelli (cecircel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Admin will monitor teachers who write frequent referrals

Person Responsible	Tim Carignan (tjcarign@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Dean will meet with students who are frequent offenders as well as teachers who write frequent referalls

Person Responsible	Tim Carignan (tjcarign@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Continue the grade level team meetings on a monthly basis so teachers can discuss discipline issues.

Person Responsible	Aaron Alves (ajalves@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Adjust as needed.

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency for SWD. Only 35% of our students were considered proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	40% of students will be proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Todd Leathead (tjleathe@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to John Hattie, students will succeed with "targeted learning." Targeted learning occurs when teachers know where the lesson is going and ensure that students know as well.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students and share with teachers

Person Responsible	LaTonya Mitchell (lmmitche@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional development - learning targets and success criteria

Person Responsible	Todd Leathead (tjleathe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify standards that students that are not proficient in

Person Responsible	Cindy Circelli (cecircel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Implement in classrooms

Person Responsible	Cindy Circelli (cecircel@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor teachers use of learning targets and success criteria

Person Responsible	Sharon Lavallee (salavall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Silver Sands works year round to ensure our students are welcomed in a positive environment on school campus, while giving them many opportunities to be a part of our surrounding community. Our school year begins with trainings on restorative practices among the staff to give them the tools they need to take care of the mental well being of our students. Throughout the year, our school participates in many community and state wide events through our many clubs and electives, such as Jr. Beta volunteers, marching band, agriculture, and chorus. Additionally, our guidance department and administrative team work to put together a community wide career fair every year that spans the many diverse career opportunities are stakeholders have to offer. Finally, our School Advisory Committee, which is composed of parents, students, teachers, and community members comes together regularly to determine the needs of our school and work together to provide for teachers and students as a whole.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00