East Bay High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

East Bay High School

7710 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amy Stevens Cox

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.](http://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

East Bay High School

7710 OLD BIG BEND RD, Gibsonton, FL 33534

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	70%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

East Bay High School will graduate students who are prepared to take advantage of opportunities to become active and productive members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prepare a generation of students who believe in their strengths, abilities and their future.

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
Stevens-Cox, Amy	Principal	Directs and coordinates educational, administrative, and counseling activities of East Bay High School. She demonstrates the Florida Principal Standards, serves as the instructional leader, and develops and evaluates educational programs to ensure conformance to state, national, and school board standards. Develops and coordinates educational programs through meetings with staff, reviews of teachers' activities, and issuance of directives. Administers and develops educational programs for students with mental or physical disabilities. Confers with teachers, students, and parents concerning educational and behavioral problems in school. Establishes and maintains relationships with colleges, community organizations, and other schools to coordinate educational services. Requisitions and allocates supplies, equipment, and instructional material as needed. Directs preparation of class schedules, cumulative records, and attendance reports. Walks about school building and property to monitor safety and security. Plans and monitors school budget. Plans for and directs building maintenance.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Amy Stevens Cox

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

123

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	94%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	426	489	457	562	1934
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	171	171	208	727
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	12	7	10	47
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	12	7	5	8	32

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	42	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 10/28/2020

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	676	629	598	548	2451
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	15	13	11	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	8	4	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	22	16	13	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	27	23	24	101

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	27	29	23	24	103

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	18	56	61	38	173
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	21	25	110

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	676	629	598	548	2451
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	15	13	11	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	8	4	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	22	16	13	78
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	27	23	24	101

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	27	29	23	24	103

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	18	56	61	38	173
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	36	21	25	110

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	42%	56%	56%	39%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	54%	51%	46%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	41%	42%	38%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	36%	49%	51%	35%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	47%	48%	48%	40%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	45%	34%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	53%	69%	68%	48%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	75%	73%	73%	74%	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	42%	55%	-13%	55%	-13%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	41%	53%	-12%	53%	-12%
	2018	44%	52%	-8%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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	53%	66%	-13%	67%	-14%
2018	48%	62%	-14%	65%	-17%
Compare		5%			

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	70%	73%	-3%	70%	0%
2018	68%	70%	-2%	68%	0%
Compare		2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	63%	-39%	61%	-37%
2018	31%	63%	-32%	62%	-31%
Compare		-7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	57%	-13%	57%	-13%
2018	42%	56%	-14%	56%	-14%
Compare		2%			

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	43	35	21	43	46	25	45		86	21
ELL	7	34	35	11	28	35	23	50		82	50
ASN	56	38		68	63		75	70		94	67
BLK	31	37	30	26	43	39	43	61		93	28

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
HSP	36	45	39	29	42	42	48	68		89	49
MUL	51	54		41	60		50	85		81	45
WHT	56	53	33	50	56	57	66	77		88	60
FRL	34	41	32	30	45	43	44	63		87	41

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	46	46	19	29	23	33	54		68	18
ELL	19	46	57	25	35	45	29	42		69	31
ASN	65	58		69	33		75	85			
BLK	38	47	41	32	39	24	42	67		88	25
HSP	41	53	45	33	39	42	44	63		83	43
MUL	68	63		47	42		57	76		70	63
WHT	53	59	53	47	51	27	62	77		80	49
FRL	39	52	47	33	40	30	43	62		80	36

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	9	35	36	12	27	24	13	38		57	7
ELL	6	25	31	18	29	29	18	43		67	41
ASN	44	53		41	39			91			
BLK	32	46	41	27	40	38	40	65		81	35
HSP	32	41	31	31	38	30	42	69		84	35
MUL	51	49	30	40	40	30	69	61		90	58
WHT	50	53	47	44	42	35	56	82		82	48
FRL	30	42	36	30	38	35	42	68		76	32

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	547
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
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	43
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	48
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	
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	45
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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance at 35%. There was a lack of intervention strategies utilized to meet the needs of students in specific subgroups that were struggling to access content.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline with an 11% drop. The state standards and lessons are not aligned. There was a lack of intervention strategies utilized to meet the needs of students in specific subgroups that were struggling to access content.

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.

Math Achievement had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. East Bay High School had a math achievement of 36% while the state average was 51%. There was a difference of 15 percentage points.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. This component had an increase of 13 percentage points.

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. increase the graduation rate.
2. Increase the learning gains for Math and ELA.
3. Increase the achievement of SWD and ELL students.
4. Increase student engagement.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	East Bay High School seeks to increase student achievement by giving students access to rigorous learning tasks that are aligned with grade level content and standards.
Measurable Outcome:	Assess via walkthroughs/observations, an increase in the percentage of students completing rigorous tasks that are aligned with complex standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide professional development, during the summer, preplanning, and throughout the school year to support teachers implementing rigorous content standards in a way that will intellectually engages students to increase academic achievement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development opportunities employ both administration and faculty and allow the exploration of unpacking standards and identifying task complexity using Marzano's taxonomy.

Action Steps to Implement

Providing faculty with professional development opportunities; for example, unpacking standards and understanding task complexity, to include high level of student work, lesson study, and PLC intervention plans.

Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

Administration and ILT will observe individual classrooms on a regular basis and provide formatted "Praise and Push" feedback to instructors through feedback tracking chart.

Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to student inclusion, participation, and involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	East Bay High School will increase student inclusion, participation, and belonging by fostering an environment that develops connections and that builds a culture of trust and respect between students and faculty.
Measurable Outcome:	Utilizing the Student Climate Survey, administration will facilitate needs based on areas that foster connections. Quarterly a student climate survey will be conducted via survey monkey to monitor the environment and to insure the school culture is inclusive in order to support learning and create a sense of belonging that is core to academic success. Specifically, survey will focus on gains in the SCIP, "my experience section" as rated by the student body.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be intentional in building classroom culture and relationships with students to create a collaborative community where students and teachers feel a sense of belonging that will increase student motivation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Increase respect and trust between teachers and students. Normalize the sense of belonging as first critical step in creating an environment that students foster connections quickly in the school.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and Teacher Leaders will provide ten-minute professional development focused on increasing classroom culture as well as inclusion, participation, and belonging of students.
Student Government will implement a process that will further build the connective relationships among peers.
Peer Jury will be trained to enhance a feeling of belonging and inclusion of "fringe" students.

Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	East Bay High School will increase academic achievement for ESL and SWD students through utilization of accommodations and differentiation to make grade level content more accessible for these students. The students in these two subgroups were below the minimum federal index percentage.
Measurable Outcome:	The students in the SWD and ELL subgroups will perform 41% or above on the federal percent of points index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide professional development for teachers on implementing accommodations and increasing inclusion for SWD and ELL students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When the content is accessible to SWD and ELL students, these students can master the content.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration and teacher leaders will focus on training teachers how to effectively implement accommodations and differentiate instruction for SWD and ELL students.

Person Responsible	Amy Stevens-Cox (amy.stevens-cox@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Administration will work on fostering an environment by focusing on outcomes that will contribute to relationships to include PLC's, classroom & facility observations, student task force and professional developments. With the implementation of various culture building strategies an environment that supports belonging and inclusion will develop.

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 uses various strategies to instill a positive school culture. These strategies include but are not limited to TRIBE awards and celebrations, mentor programs, clubs, PBIS, student Turnaround awards, social media, and many more things.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.