Keystone Heights Junior/ Senior High

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://khh.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Burke   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
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 Clay 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

Keystone Heights Junior/Senior High

900 ORCHID AVE, Keystone Heights, FL 32656

http://khh.oneclay.net

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 7-12	No	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous and relevant; which transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

KHHS exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace.

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
Burke, Laurie	Principal	School Instructional Leader; Science
Underwood, Barry	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader; Social Studies
Oody, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader; Language Arts
Denmark, Sarah	Assistant Principal	School Instructional Leader; Math

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Laurie Burke

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.*
1

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
82

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	56%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
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	201	230	218	177	199	171	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	37	65	39	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	13	13	7	6	84
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	16	0	17	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	17	0	15	0	64
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	12	15	25	10	0	87
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	20	29	10	0	95

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	19	15	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	4	0	0	0	0	6
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 9/21/2020

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	201	230	218	177	199	171	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	37	65	39	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	13	13	7	6	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	33	0	32	0	129
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	28	35	54	20	0	182

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	19	15	17	40	18	0	109

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	2	4	0	0	32	0	38
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	201	230	218	177	199	171	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	36	37	65	39	0	212
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	25	13	13	7	6	84
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	33	0	32	0	129
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	28	35	54	20	0	182

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	19	15	17	40	18	0	109

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	2	4	0	0	32	0	38
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	52%	60%	56%	46%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	52%	51%	45%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	39%	42%	34%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	51%	56%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	49%	46%	48%	52%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	38%	45%	42%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	58%	73%	68%	46%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	81%	73%	67%	78%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(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
07	2019	54%	59%	-5%	52%	2%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	51%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	55%	62%	-7%	56%	-1%
	2018	52%	67%	-15%	58%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
09	2019	52%	61%	-9%	55%	-3%
	2018	43%	56%	-13%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	45%	57%	-12%	53%	-8%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	53%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	65%	63%	2%	54%	11%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	54%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	46%	49%	-3%	46%	0%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	54%	64%	-10%	48%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	67%	-15%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	72%	-6%	67%	-1%
2018	96%	90%	6%	65%	31%
Compare		-30%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	80%	-15%	71%	-6%
2018	66%	78%	-12%	71%	-5%
Compare		-1%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	80%	-3%	70%	7%
2018	67%	78%	-11%	68%	-1%
Compare		10%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	65%	-8%	61%	-4%
2018	63%	66%	-3%	62%	1%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	64%	1%	57%	8%
2018	64%	61%	3%	56%	8%
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	24	41	32	27	41	38	32	40		91	41
BLK	25	35	30	53	62		46				
HSP	45	63	70	50	54		67	92			
MUL	30	60		47	44		19				
WHT	54	51	42	60	48	38	59	70	72	91	72
FRL	42	48	45	56	47	42	51	60	70	90	60

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	37	34	32	47	44	43	33		67	50
BLK	41	63		36	33			50			
HSP	41	44	36	51	53	64	40	76			
MUL	30	32		40	63			50			
WHT	51	48	37	61	60	53	63	67	67	86	66
FRL	44	47	39	52	56	56	54	63	67	74	53

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	14	30	24	26	39	32	20	38		56	36
BLK	31			38	30						
HSP	41	42		50	46		47	70			
MUL	33	27		40	38	40					
WHT	47	46	36	57	53	43	46	68	41	82	65
FRL	38	42	31	47	49	39	37	60	41	77	59

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	60
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	660
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
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	63
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	60
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	56
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.

Science/Biology Showed the Largest Drop.
Factors include district shift in the year that biology was offered as a course; staff member resigned mid-year.

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

Biology from 96 to 66.
Factors include district shift in the year that biology was offered as a course; staff member resigned mid year.

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/Biology
Factors include district shift in the year that biology was offered as a course; staff member resigned mid year.

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

ELA Lowest 25%; concentrated efforts by veteran staff; tier two and three interventions with fidelity across the subject area.

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

Attendance globally below district and state averages.

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

1. 10% improvement across core FSA/EOC
2. Graduation improvement to 93%
3. Raise attendance rate to 95%
4. Reduce referral rate by 15%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance Raising attendance rates will increase the amount of time students are in class learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Raise attendance rates from 92 to 94.5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barry Underwood (barry.underwood@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Incentive programs have been created to encourage students to be present, posters and information posted encouraging students to be present and prepared. Strive for less that 5 and All Here are other attendance initiative programs that will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Incentive programs give students an opportunity to continue doing the right thing and feel appreciated. Positive Behavior Incentive Programs are a driving force behind education. We will know we have achieved this when our attendance rate has improved.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assess Data from Previous Year and First 20 days of school.
2. Community Partnership School and Children's Home Society are working with our community partners to post and share information about the importance of regular attendance in school and generate positive incentives for student attendance.
3. PBIS-Offer incentives for student attendance
4. Implement 7 mindsets to address social and emotional needs of students.

Person Responsible	Barry Underwood (barry.underwood@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	There was a spike in our referral rate during the 2018-2019 school year. Students should not be missing class and instructional time due because of discipline issues. If we can change the mindset of students by overcoming negative behaviors in the classroom we can increase student engagement and enhance their educational experience.
Measurable Outcome:	Reduce referral rate by 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Barry Underwood (barry.underwood@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Incentive Programs, Indian Bucks used with the Trading Post to reward students on campus. 7 Mindsets training for students and teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Positive Behavior Incentive Programs encourage positive behaviors by rewarding students for improved and appropriate behaviors. This goal will be achieved if the referral rate decreased by 15%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Explain PBIS (Indian Bucks) to Faculty and Students.
2. Continue to create community partners to help assist with Trading Post Incentives.
3. Recognize Students for Positive behaviors and give them Indian Bucks.
4. Students and Teachers are participating in 7 mindsets during "news" time once a week to address mindset changes and overcoming obstacles.

Person Responsible	Barry Underwood (barry.underwood@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing graduation rates indicates higher pass rates on FSA Reading and Algebra I EOCs.
Measurable Outcome:	Graduation Rates will improve from 91% to 92%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Dykes (kim.dykes@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strive for less than 5 Absences, School Day SAT, Achieve Practice for Struggling Readers, PERT TEsting for Algebra I, After School Tutoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These district initiatives that will provide students with the opportunity to meet graduation requirements. Also providing practice and time in class to meet requirements. Achievement will be determined by improving graduation rates from 91% to 92%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strive for Less than 5 Absences
2. School Day SAT
3. PERT Opportunities
4. Track Seniors through Grad Tracker
5. One-on-One counseling for Seniors.
6. Intensive Reading Classes teaching SAT/ACT Strategies.

Person Responsible   Kim Dykes (kim.dykes@myoneclay.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student Outcomes Improving teacher differentiation skills for all students, specifically students with level 1 on previous years state assessments. Using formal and informal data to identify specific areas will provide teachers insight for student needs.
Measurable Outcome:	10% Improvement on FSA and EOC scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Tutoring After school, administering practice test to improve test taking skills, district initiative protocols to be implemented in the classroom using data driven instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tutoring, practice testing, teachers tracking data in classroom, using district curriculum specialists, performance matters assessments. This goal will be achieved when FSA/EOC scores have increased by 10% in all areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers assess data from previous year and current year using progress monitoring data, informal and formal assessments.
2. Teachers using protocals during PLCs to address problem areas based on assessments used to drive instruction.
3. Test practice through the year to drive instruction and meet standards.
4. Content Specialists will collaborate with teachers to provide content and data support.
5. Identify master teachers on campus and have them model instruction.

Person Responsible	Laurie Burke (laurie.burke@myoneclay.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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.

The school will use social media and after school events to build positive relationships with parents, family, community stakeholders. Our social media platforms include Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. All platforms keep the community and parents informed about what is happening academically in the classrooms as well as sporting events throughout the school year. We are also a community partnership school with Children's Home Society and have a community program called the "Trading Post" that will provide the students and community with food, clothing, medical needs, counseling services, and school supplies when necessary.

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00