
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Middleburg High School

3750 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://mhs.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Martin Aftuck

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	49%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Middleburg High School

3750 COUNTY ROAD 220, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://mhs.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 PK, 9-12	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	18%

School Grades History

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

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.

To provide a safe, educational environment that fosters students' intellectual, social, emotional and physical potential, empowering them to become productive, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Middleburg High School Beliefs:

- *Students will develop the skills necessary to think independently and become effective problem solvers.
- *Students will develop an appreciation and understanding of the value of lifelong learning through enrichment courses and activities.
- *Teachers will encourage students to learn valuable lessons through athletics, performing arts and other extracurricular activities.
- *Teachers will engage the intellectual curiosity and creativity of students, allowing them to become multifaceted learners.
- *Students will learn to accept and adapt to change and will recognize the value of work.
- *Teachers will encourage students to create ethical relationships with other students, faculty members and all members of the community.
- *Students will develop a positive sense of leadership, personal responsibility, and good citizenship.
- *Students will develop awareness of career opportunities and the skills and education required for entrance into various occupational fields.
- *Teachers will encourage a sense of community within the school and provide an atmosphere that encourages parental participation.
- *All members of the school community will strive to create an environment of toleration of diverse opinions and beliefs.

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
Aftuck, Martin	Principal	Beginning Teacher Program Curriculum council Faculty newsletter Marketing coordinator Parking/Towing PD coordinator PLC design/calendar/facilitation lead SAC SPA entries/acceptance Walk-through calendar
Williams, Justin	Assistant Principal	Activities/calendar AP Coordinator/Chris Bryan College interns/SPRINT Facebook/marquee Facilities rental Field trip/transportation/vans NMSI Parking decals request Property Control Safety drills Testing scheduling/monitoring Senior discipline, Juniors L-Z

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/28/2020, Martin Aftuck

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.*

2

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

109

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	49%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	0	0	0	466	444	424	370	1704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	39	38	41	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	10	4	2	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	35	24	142
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	144	36	38	264
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	79	49	51	247
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	68	37	110
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0

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	57%	60%	56%	45%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	52%	51%	46%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	39%	42%	40%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	55%	51%	62%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	46%	48%	52%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	38%	45%	35%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	67%	73%	68%	57%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	81%	73%	73%	78%	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	63%	61%	2%	55%	8%
	2018	51%	56%	-5%	53%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	53%	57%	-4%	53%	0%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	53%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

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	69%	72%	-3%	67%	2%
2018	94%	90%	4%	65%	29%
Compare		-25%			

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	80%	80%	0%	70%	10%
2018	74%	78%	-4%	68%	6%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	65%	-15%	61%	-11%
2018	63%	66%	-3%	62%	1%
Compare		-13%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	64%	0%	57%	7%
2018	55%	61%	-6%	56%	-1%
Compare		9%			

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	21	32	25	29	40	30	44	53		79	61
ELL											
BLK	42	42	18	41	56		45	63		73	
HSP	55	45	50	59	41	31	71	79		94	52
MUL	68	62		58	68		79	80		100	45
WHT	58	51	34	60	50	47	67	81		88	71
FRL	49	44	32	53	51	51	62	74		83	63

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	17	34	31	31	37	25		52		66	29
BLK	20	33	31	27	50	38		39		79	33
HSP	52	53	47	52	54	50	91	82		85	45
MUL	53	31		48	33						
WHT	52	48	39	62	54	35	96	75		81	54
FRL	44	44	36	54	49	31	92	66		76	49

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	37	39	31	38	27	27	44		58	33
BLK	19	28	28	41	32	21	29	62		75	42

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
HSP	42	41	29	58	47	33	48	81		75	60
MUL	50	57		52	50		50	85		82	
WHT	46	47	41	64	53	35	60	72		81	52
FRL	37	42	38	56	49	33	52	63		76	45

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	60
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	661
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	60
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	

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	48
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	58
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	70
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	61
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.

Our ELA Lowest 25th Percentile component showed the lowest performance at 34%. The scores decreased from the previous year, as did scores for the county and state, thus following a trend for this component. Our students showed the lowest performance on the Integration of Knowledge and Key Ideas and Details categories on the FSA. ELA teachers are required to dissect the data for individual students and focus on the standards in these categories to increase overall scores.

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

In 2019, Science Achievement scores were at 67% as compared to 95% in 2018. When Biology was moved from 9th grade to 10th grade, it caused 2018 scores to be skewed due to testing only Biology Honors level students that year. When we compare our 2019 scores to a similar testing group inclusive of a wide range of students in 2017, we actually increased our scores by 10%.

Biology EOC % Passed
 2015-2016 388 of 430 44%
 2016-2017 396 of 471 57%
 2017-2018 146 of 153 *Honors Students only 95%
 2018-2019 67%

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.

We had two factors with a gap of 8% when compared to the state average.

The school ELA Lowest 25th Percentile component average is 34% compared to the state average of 42%. The scores decreased from the previous year, as did scores for the county and state, thus following a trend for this component. Our students showed the lowest performance on the Integration of Knowledge and Key Ideas and Details categories on the FSA. ELA teachers are required to dissect the data for individual students and focus on the standards in these categories to increase overall scores.

The Math Achievement component shows our school at 59% as compared to the state average of 51%. We did not show a decrease or growth from the previous year, but our scores are 8% higher than the state average. This is even taking into account that our Algebra classes are strictly students who have scored a 1 or 2 due to the junior high schools testing students with a 3 or above in 8th grade.

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

The Math Lowest 25th Percentile component for 2019 increased to 48% from 36% in 2018. Our school took steps to intentionally schedule students into Algebra 1A and 1B block classes. Administration has placed teachers with proven track records and experience to increase scores and help students succeed. The Math Department is also utilizing Chromebooks for self-directed practice to achieve student growth.

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

N/A

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

1. ELA Lower Quartile Gains
2. Increased average daily attendance
3. Increase Mental Health support

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase ELA Lower Quartile Student Gains. We want to assist lower quartile students in making gains in ELA because it has the greatest impact on school grade.

Measurable Outcome: The number of ELA Lower Quartile students making learning gains will increase by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: 1. ELA department will implement and utilize a spreadsheet that tracks not only the lower quartile, but the bottom 33%. This tracker includes any key players involved in specific student's day, including all subject area teachers. Teachers will meet in groups to discuss strategies to assist specific students that they have in common. Reading and writing strategies will be implemented throughout the school and in every subject area to assist the ELA department.

2. Technology access for teachers and students will benefit the Lower Quartile students. Teachers will use Achieve 3000 data and track lexile scores through the year. Individual data tracking on the student's behalf will help them take ownership of their own learning and growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Tracker will assist not only ELA teachers, but all subject area teachers to track specific students in the lower 33%, work in groups to brainstorm ideas that will assist individual student needs, and improve overall ELA scores. The students will be assisted on all fronts throughout the day, thus showing the importance of reading and writing skills in every subject. Evidence of this strategy's success should be seen through lexile score increases on Achieve 3000. ELA and Reading teachers will track Achieve 3000 scores throughout the year to monitor growth of the lowest 33%.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create and distribute spreadsheet identifying lower 33%.
2. All subject area teachers meet as a group to discuss individual student needs.
3. Teachers implement strategies that were discussed in the meeting.
4. Reading and ELA teachers track lexile score growth using Achieve 3000.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Attendance: We know that we cannot teach students who are not at school. We need attendance to increase so that we can achieve a higher school grade.

Measurable Outcome:

The goal is for our school's average daily attendance to be over 97%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

This year, we are utilizing the "All Here" program. This is an outside company that will be focusing on data and targeting students with low attendance by making phone calls and sending text messages to absentees, and helping navigate through attendance meetings. We believe that this will help us alleviate chronic absenteeism.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We chose the "All Here" program to help us reach our average daily attendance goals because the company utilizes data, contacts absentees, and assists in attendance meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Calculate attendance data.
2. Align our school with the "All Here" program.
3. Monitor the results of the "All Here" program throughout the school year.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase Provided Student Mental Health Services. Students who struggle with issues should have an outlet and a source for support. Our school wants to increase services that we provide for student mental health. We believe that we will see growth in attendance, school program participation, scores, and overall student well being.

Measurable Outcome: We will use the Panorama Student Survey. This survey gathers student's perceptions of school experiences and gives us an insight to overall student social and emotional health.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will use the data from the Panorama Survey and brainstorm strategies to combat any social or emotional issues. This school year, we have added an additional full-time Mental Health Counselor. Our mental health counselors will work closely with students and teachers to implement strategies for specific students. We have also implemented a Student Service Team who work to complete social projects and bring awareness to fellow classmates. We had a "Start with Hello" presenter speak to all of our P.E. classes about the importance of being connected at school. Lastly, we have a monthly newsletter to faculty and staff in regards to mental health that includes helpful ideas and strategies to improve Student Mental Health.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using the survey will help us implement strategies that will increase overall student mental health. Using the data from last year has already helped us move forward in this area and add additional support services.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implemented Student Service Team.
2. 7 Mindset curriculum implementation through Enrichment
3. "Start with Hello" presentation to all P.E. classes.
4. Students will take the Panorama Survey.
5. Our team will use this data to brainstorm strategies to combat any social or emotional issues.

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.

Other school-wide improvement priorities are being addressed through Action Teams. Administration divided areas of improvement into five categories, including Climate and Culture, Curriculum and Instruction, Discipline and Safety, Family and Community, and Marketing and Design. Teachers and staff work together in the Action Teams to discuss and solve issues pertaining to the designated team.

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.

Stakeholder input provided through SAC committee, parent and student surveys, teacher climate surveys and action teams. We then use that data to formulate a community action plan to guide the work taking place.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00