

Clay County Schools

Green Cove Springs Junior 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Green Cove Springs Junior High School

1220 BONAVENTURE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://gcj.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Justin FAU Lkner

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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)	41%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Green Cove Springs Junior High School

1220 BONAVENTURE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

<http://gcj.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 7-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>33%</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>32%</p>

School Grades History

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

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.

The mission of Green Cove Springs Junior High is to achieve academic excellence by cultivating student ownership, developing lifelong learners, and fostering a safe, caring culture that benefits the entire community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Green Cove Springs Junior High will provide quality education in a safe environment for our diverse student population where social responsibility is fostered and all students are motivated to master academic goals.

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
Halter, Jen	Principal	Principal
Demarie, James	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Green, Monica	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Bleau, Chera	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head
Mason, Lisa	School Counselor	
Stutts, Larianne	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Justin FAU Lkner

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.*

7

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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)	41%
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 (70%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 .	

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	378	403	0	0	0	0	781
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	33	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	44	0	0	0	0	102
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	43	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	52	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	69	0	0	0	0	139

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

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	401	426	0	0	0	0	827
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	14	8	0	0	0	0	22

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	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	401	426	0	0	0	0	827
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	14	8	0	0	0	0	22

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	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	65%	61%	54%	65%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	58%	54%	60%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	49%	47%	47%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	80%	69%	58%	77%	69%	56%
Math Learning Gains	75%	63%	57%	74%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	56%	51%	59%	53%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	66%	51%	65%	60%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	81%	72%	83%	81%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
	(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	63%	59%	4%	52%	11%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	51%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	68%	62%	6%	56%	12%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	78%	63%	15%	54%	24%
	2018	74%	58%	16%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	61%	49%	12%	46%	15%
	2018	55%	52%	3%	45%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	69%	64%	5%	48%	21%
	2018	73%	67%	6%	50%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	78%	80%	-2%	71%	7%
2018	83%	78%	5%	71%	12%
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	97%	65%	32%	61%	36%
2018	100%	66%	34%	62%	38%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%
2018	95%	61%	34%	56%	39%
Compare		5%			

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	31	49	50	52	67	60	45	47	38		
ELL	15	31		46	80	73					
ASN	84	69		90	82		75	100	76		
BLK	44	44	42	58	76	71	47	59	62		
HSP	61	63	54	73	69	54	52	75	76		
MUL	59	67		88	75		69	92	75		
WHT	69	62	61	84	75	71	76	81	74		
FRL	48	53	55	66	73	66	55	64	52		

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	37	47	35	46	49	40	50	70	35		
ELL	24	48	38	40	67	71	27	70			
ASN	81	71		94	80			100			
BLK	43	47	49	51	59	51	51	68	56		
HSP	62	58	32	65	61	53	69	82	73		
MUL	54	56		67	65		60	85	43		
WHT	68	64	48	80	71	50	79	85	76		
FRL	47	50	42	61	59	45	58	71	54		
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	29	47	47	42	59	53	31	67	37		
ELL	27	36	38	45	64	53		53			
ASN	86	73		93	100				83		
BLK	35	42	42	52	63	51	41	64	53		
HSP	59	68	47	65	61	44	51	76	60		
MUL	61	55		83	70			88			
WHT	69	61	48	81	76	64	70	86	61		
FRL	46	54	42	64	72	59	49	74	30		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	677
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	49
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	82
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	56
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	64
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	75
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	73
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	59
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was the lower quartile (LQ) learning gains on the Reading ELA FSA. Green Cove Junior continues to focus on LQ learning gains with increased academic expectations for all students. We expect to start our Cougar Nation intervention block second semester as we are focusing on Covid health and safety procedures while starting schools back up and making every attempt to limit student movement.

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

The Civics EOC scores showed the greatest decline from the previous year; 6%. The primary factor contributing to this was that there was a larger percentage of non-proficient readers in the 2019 testing year than from the previous 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.

When compared to the state average, GCJ students scored higher in every category component. We averaged a higher score of 7% in each component in 2019 compared to 6% in 2018.

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

The cohort reading scores showed the greatest improvement of 8%. We continued to implement our Cougar Nation intervention block where students were strategically placed in a one time a week class where the teacher focused on the students' greatest need for remediation. The school-wide focus was reading and math instruction.

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

Failing grade in ELA/Math: our 7th graders are showing a higher percentage of current failing grades in ELA and Math (15% of students) compared to 8th graders (11% of students).

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

1. Reading Achievement for LQ students
2. Math Achievement for LQ students
3. Reading Proficiency

4. Math Proficiency
5. Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The instructional practice specifically related to Student Engagement will continue to be an area of focus for GCJ including how attentive and invested students are in their class, including how excited they are about going to class, how often they get so focused on activities that they lose track of time, how eager they are to participate, how often they talk about ideas from their classes, and overall how interested they are in their classes. Student who are excited about their learning, have a vested interest and see the rationale in what they are doing are more likely to be academically successful.</p> <p>GCJ saw a 9% drop in Engagement to 21% in the Winter 2020 Survey when compared to the Fall of 2019 of 30%. This was following a 4% increase from the Winter of 2019 Survey of 26%.</p>
---	--

Measurable Outcome: An increase of 5% in Student Engagement on the Fall 2020 Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jen Halter (jennifer.halter@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher led Checks for Understanding imbedded in daily lessons such as use of exit tickets, thumbs up/down, use of whiteboards, self assessments, example/non-example, 4-3-2-1 learning scales.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent Checks for Understanding has proven to show students stay more engaged in their learning and find it relevant.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs.
 Document the frequency teachers Check for student Understanding in a lesson.
 Provide feedback to teachers and professional development time for them to plan CFU's.
 Students are administered the Fall 2020 Panorama Survey.

Person Responsible: Jen Halter (jennifer.halter@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Focusing on the school's mission statement that students will take ownership for their learning, students answered questions on the 2020 Panorama Survey that showed a 3% decrease in to complete or achieve important long-term goals.

Measurable Outcome: An increase of 3% in student engagement and achieving short and long-term goals by student responses on the Fall 2020 Panorama Survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Student led ownership for implementing and achieving their goals. Class projects, completing homework and school work and meeting deadlines for all assignments. Evidence will be visible in FOCUS and report cards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Consistent monitoring of student goals has proven that when students are held accountable for their learning, they tend to meet their goals, and then start new ones. This strategy ties directly into Student Emotional Learning (SEL).

Action Steps to Implement

Document in FOCUS student grades and monitor for failing grades.
 Provide feedback and support to students that have failing grades.
 Every quarter, have students do self-assessments of their learning goals (short and long-term).

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Other specifically relating to School-wide intervention Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	35% of students are not proficient in Reading and 20% of students are not proficient in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	An increase of 2% Proficiency levels on state Reading and Math assessments. An increase of 2% Learning Gains on state Reading and Math assessments. 70% of students show growth from their baseline to end of year assessments on Achieve Levelset, iReady, and/or Performance Matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data Chats following district level Performance Matters assessments every 9 weeks. Classroom walkthrough notes and logs to identify areas teachers are excelling on and next steps to continue to improve practice. Cougar Nation (second semester) - weekly remediation program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Regular and consistent use of assessment data allows for teachers to improve practice with targeted remediation which increases student achievement. Targeted small group instruction has proven to help students improve skills.

Action Steps to Implement

- Plan department data chats to analyze Performance Matters data and plan for next 9 weeks.
- Plan and schedule classroom walkthroughs and log CFU's.
- Plan and schedule students into Cougar Nation.
- Plan and implement weekly small group targeted interventions.
- Staff time to monitor and adjust lesson plans for small group instruction.

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.

The School Leadership Team will continue to focus on the student and teacher Cambridge attributes of confidence, responsibility, reflectiveness, innovation, and engagement.

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.

GCJ builds a positive school culture by continuing to demand high expectations for academic, social, emotional, and personal success from all students and by continuing to reinforce the positive relationships among all stakeholders. The learning environment is closely monitored to ensure it is conducive for the safety, health, and success of all students and staff with the involvement of stakeholders such as the Parent Volunteer Organization which meets and hosts numerous events throughout the school year for teachers, students, and parents; Parent Night for our Pre-AICE Cambridge program; a Virtual Open House for all parents where students take ownership of their learning and present their reflection on the first 9 weeks of school to their parents; local and school law enforcement which are part of the School Safety Leadership Team and participate in school-based drills; and school-based extracurricular parent volunteers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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