Pierce Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Pablo Gallejo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 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.

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

Pierce Middle School

5511 N HESPERIDES ST, Tampa, FL 33614

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

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.

Pierce Middle School will provide and environment of Respect, Responsibility and Pride in academics and behavior.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pierce Middle School will become the hub of the community through student success.

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
Gallego Alvarez, Pablo	Principal	Along with the Principal, the school leadership team consist of AP, SALs, Academic Coaches, and Team Leaders. Members are included in the decision making in school, and serve a role in developing tools to assist teachers in building their pedagogy. Leadership team is divided into three other teams. A. The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) Principal Reading Coach Teachers form all three grade levels and different subject areas. The ILT is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in the curricular domain. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. B. Team Leaders PLC APA Team leaders form all the different grade levels The team Leaders PLC is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation discipline and attendance plans utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Support the implementation of high quality instructional and behavior practices at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of implementation of the school wide discipline plan and attainment of SIP goal(s) in the discipline and attendance domains. C. Instructional Coaches Team APC All Instructional Coaches. Subject Area Leaders (SALs) Instructional Coaches Team is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Initiating school-wide strategies/verbage- checks within department member's classrooms. 3. Establish monthly lists of students with academic student concerns or in need of remediation. 4. Assist in professional development creation and execution, encourage department members to be a demonstration classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/1/2016, Pablo Gallejo

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.*
4

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (50%) 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	261	261	303	0	0	0	0	825
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	82	82	0	0	0	0	207
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	34	38	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	23	9	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	19	11	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	38	35	0	0	0	0	114
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	26	53	0	0	0	0	111

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	37	58	0	0	0	0	95

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	63	27	59	0	0	0	0	149
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	7

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	306	274	332	0	0	0	0	912
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	37	53	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	4	7	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	118	88	0	0	0	0	229
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	108	115	0	0	0	0	345

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	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	12

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	15	26	27	0	0	0	0	68
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	306	274	332	0	0	0	0	912
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	37	53	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	4	7	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	118	88	0	0	0	0	229
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	108	115	0	0	0	0	345

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	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	12

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	15	26	27	0	0	0	0	68
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	39%	51%	54%	39%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	52%	54%	47%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	47%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	49%	55%	58%	45%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	56%	57%	57%	59%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	52%	51%	52%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	32%	47%	51%	28%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	67%	72%	52%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	34%	53%	-19%	54%	-20%
	2018	31%	52%	-21%	52%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2019	35%	54%	-19%	52%	-17%
	2018	34%	52%	-18%	51%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	39%	53%	-14%	56%	-17%
	2018	39%	54%	-15%	58%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	39%	49%	-10%	55%	-16%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	53%	62%	-9%	54%	-1%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
	2018	21%	29%	-8%	45%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	30%	47%	-17%	48%	-18%
	2018	28%	48%	-20%	50%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	67%	-19%	71%	-23%
2018	48%	65%	-17%	71%	-23%
Compare		0%			

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	89%	63%	26%	61%	28%
2018	89%	63%	26%	62%	27%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	27	34	31	27	33	31	17	40			
ELL	19	46	44	31	53	50	10	36	84		
ASN	43	33		76	71						
BLK	43	44	53	43	51	53	25	39			
HSP	38	47	43	48	56	49	34	52	88		
MUL	56	67		63	73						
WHT	40	40	33	50	47	35	30	58	70		
FRL	39	46	44	49	55	48	32	52	87		
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	16	38	37	19	44	43	13	31			
ELL	19	45	48	31	54	55	14	38	82		
ASN	54	72		63	72		60				
BLK	23	39	22	32	53	54	12	40			
HSP	41	52	48	48	55	51	34	55	87		

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
WHT	43	49	50	52	54	50	42	50			
FRL	39	52	46	47	55	52	33	51	88		

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	5	37	41	10	40	46	7	16			
ELL	20	42	42	30	62	62	8	33	88		
ASN	57	61		70	84		69	91			
BLK	19	31	26	22	47	29	16	45			
HSP	41	48	42	47	61	57	27	52	83		
WHT	31	50	63	33	41	33	26	39			
FRL	38	47	43	44	59	52	27	51	81		

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	49
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	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	488
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	56
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	44
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	49
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	65
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	45
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	49
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 FSA scores for the school are at a 32% level 3 and above. Lack of reading skills from our high population of ELL students.

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

ELA learning gains declined from 52% to 46%. A decrease in attendance from students, and a need to increase reading strategies across curriculum to create the foundations for the current school 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.

Social Studies scores in comparison to the state are 51% 3 and above for the school and 72% 3 and above for the state. Lack of reading skills from our high population of ELL students.

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

Math achievement scores increased from 47% to 49%. Improving the PLC format of the department. Archer Zone tutoring during lunch periods.

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

An improvement in attendance from students is crucial to increase student learning in all areas.

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

1. Attendance incentives for students
2. Focus on reading strategies across curriculum
3. Increasing rigor in the classroom
4. Focus on the bottom quartile students
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Increase rigor in the classroom with focus on reading and literacy	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase rigor in the classroom with focus on reading and literacy. Our ESE students data show under performing in ELA and they are also lacking reading and literacy skills. Large population of ELL students lacking reading and literacy skills.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve school-wide scores in all content areas by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Maintaining a reading coach through title one funding. The focus of Archer Zone this school year is reading and reading strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students learning English as a second language as well as our students with learning disabilities will benefit from this strategy by acquiring reading skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reading coach will pull ELL and ESE students in small groups to work on reading skills.
2. Reading coach will work with teachers to provide strategies for teaching literacy in all content areas.
3. Teachers will be able to see and understand the reading levels of every student and monitor their progress.
4. PD will be provided school-wide for all teachers to improve implementation of best practices.
5. Coaches will participate in the subject area PLCs providing support, data, and coaching for all the teachers.

Person Responsible	Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Creating a STEM culture and Industry	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Creating a STEM culture to create a new era of problem solvers that exposes them to STEM related activities. Students will be introduced to industry certifications to better their knowledge of technology/office resources that may help them later in life.
Measurable Outcome:	STEM culture will be present in all classrooms making connections to their own content area. Industry certifications will be completed through computer applications and digital information technology.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pablo Gallego Alvarez (pablo.gallegoalvarez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Full implementation of the robotics curriculum All students will be introduced to computer applications and industry certifications through the wheel and the opportunity to take the course as their elective.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Exposing students to the robotics curriculum and industry certifications will grow their interest in STEM engineering and coding as well as Office Suite.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Collaborating with other neighborhood schools to participate in robotics and STEM activities.
2. Kait pen technology in every math class
3. Providing access to all teachers to STEM related trainings.
4. Entering and participating in Robotics competitions in the district

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.

Student Attendance
Parental Involvement in School

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.

Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
Parent information and/or education opportunities
Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
Campus visits
Shadow days
Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.

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