

St. Lucie Public Schools

Dan McCarty Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Dan Mccarty Middle School

1201 MISSISSIPPI AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/dmm/>

Demographics

Principal: Latricia Stubbs

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	92%
2020-21 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: C (42%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Dan Mccarty Middle School

1201 MISSISSIPPI AVE, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/dmm/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	80%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

Dan McCarty Middle School is preparing each child to be a valued member of society by providing the social and academic skills to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Social and academic lessons that are challenging, engaging, and relevant will be provided to each child, every day.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sullivan, Lisa	Principal	Principal
Barriner, Terrance	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Piscopo, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Carter, Samantha	Administrative Support	Admin Support Credit Checks, Family and Community Involvement, Parent Liaison
Wright, Ronald	Dean	Dean
Hett, John	Dean	Dean

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/23/2021, Latricia Stubbs

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

807

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

8

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	266	282	270	0	0	0	0	818	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	130	161	169	0	0	0	0	460	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	78	70	0	0	0	0	234	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	65	77	0	0	0	0	171	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	22	55	0	0	0	0	127	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	116	99	0	0	0	0	320	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	109	120	0	0	0	0	369	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	193	0	0	0	0	0	285	

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	188	215	181	0	0	0	0	584	

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	13	0	0	0	0	13	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	0	0	0	0	18	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - 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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	132	178	0	0	0	0	428	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	94	104	0	0	0	0	241	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	13	0	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	91	124	0	0	0	0	308	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	126	140	0	0	0	0	375	

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	210	195	207	0	0	0	0	612	

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	4	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	12	0	0	0	0	26	

2020-21 - 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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	132	178	0	0	0	0	428	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	94	104	0	0	0	0	241	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	13	0	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	91	124	0	0	0	0	308	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	126	140	0	0	0	0	375	

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	210	195	207	0	0	0	0	612	

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	12	0	0	0	0	26

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				26%	44%	54%	30%	43%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				39%	51%	54%	51%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	45%	47%	58%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				29%	45%	58%	33%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				45%	51%	57%	57%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	51%	51%	54%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				28%	41%	51%	28%	42%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				46%	64%	72%	58%	70%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	19%	51%	-32%	54%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	21%	49%	-28%	52%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
08	2021					
	2019	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-21%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	19%	47%	-28%	55%	-36%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	29%	50%	-21%	54%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
08	2021					
	2019	14%	34%	-20%	46%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	26%	48%	-22%	48%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	42%	67%	-25%	71%	-29%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	79%	51%	28%	61%	18%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	55%	39%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA and Math data used for progress monitoring was iReady Diagnostics.

Science and Civics progress monitoring data was district created through data from Unit Assessments.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	21	21
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	23	24
	Students With Disabilities	3	9	9
	English Language Learners	7	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	40	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	42	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	21	15
	English Language Learners	23	20	21

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	26	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	24	24
	Students With Disabilities	0	2	2
	English Language Learners	5	4	4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	31	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	32	32
	Students With Disabilities	2	0	0
	English Language Learners	22	24	24
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	5	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	5	7
	Students With Disabilities	3	3	3
	English Language Learners	2	2	0

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	28	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	28	28
	Students With Disabilities	10	26	26
	English Language Learners	3	7	7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	13	13
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	13	13
	Students With Disabilities	7	9	9
	English Language Learners	6	5	5
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17	21	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	22	21
	Students With Disabilities	3	11	3
	English Language Learners	7	9	11

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	13	26	27	9	27	37	3	19			
ELL	20	37	30	18	43	58	17	27	55		
BLK	19	35	35	17	38	44	12	41	54		
HSP	27	37	26	30	42	56	29	38	70		
MUL	29	38		26	37			43			
WHT	39	45		40	46		15	56			
FRL	24	38	35	22	39	47	18	42	55		
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	15	29	29	16	39	40	29	29			
ELL	10	31	39	26	48	52	13	33			
BLK	23	37	34	23	43	48	23	40	74		

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	27	40	47	41	51	49	35	52	83		
MUL	44	62		29	50						
WHT	35	46	40	36	43		31	60			
FRL	24	39	37	27	43	48	24	45	78		
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	22	58	53	22	51	49	23	30			
ELL	13	47	53	20	59	59	5	39			
BLK	26	49	57	30	58	55	23	57	90		
HSP	31	56	63	36	55	48	30	56	68		
MUL	67	54		33	64						
WHT	41	49	55	48	58	53	50	64			
FRL	29	51	57	32	59	57	24	57	85		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	90%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	34
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	35
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

2019 Our Black, ELL, ED and SWD subgroups perform lower in ELA and Math both in achievement and learning gains.

Our 6th Grade ELA and Math both have the highest percentage difference below the district.

2021 We saw a decline in all areas

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

2019 ELA and Math Achievement Level and Learning Gains

2021 Data showed a significant drop in Science Proficiency from 28% to 18%

2021 Data showed a significant drop in MS Acceleration from 79% to 58%

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

2019 Many of our core teams were comprised of new teachers and/or new team members. This made the CLP process choppy than anticipated.

2021 We had a large fluctuation of students moving between traditional and My School Students. Instructional strategies were not as strong or fluid due to Covid restrictions in classrooms.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

2019 We had a decrease in percentage points in each cell in 2019 except for Science, which maintained 28%.

2021 We had a decrease in percentage points in each cell area.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

2019- The 8th Grade Science Team had weekly, in-person CLPs with the district science leads.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

CLPs (focus on common understanding of standards, planned questions, planned monitoring of questions,

Monthly Focus for Instructional Strategies and Practices

Evidence of Instructional Strategies and CLPs in Lesson plans

In House PD

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers have a Monthly Instructional Focus that details specific strategies and practices for them to implement in their lesson plans and classrooms.

Multiple PD sessions are offered for these strategies and practices. Admin will monitor and provide feedback during walks.

Admin are present at CLPs. District support for curriculum will attend CLPs as needed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Instructional teams of teachers were carefully selected this year in order to ensure sustainability. PD is going to be chunked out monthly and teachers will all have the same monthly focus. This allows for a SSC Mindset.

PD is offered at different times in order to ensure teachers have multiple opportunities to learn.

New teachers will be supported through NEST.

Additional PD will be developed and given based on teacher need.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

African-American students, ELL students, ED students and SWD all fall below the 41% threshold. This makes these subgroups areas of critical need.

Measurable Outcome:

All of the identified subgroups will show growth in the 2021 2022 school year and achieve over the 41% threshold. We will track student progress through iReady diagnostics and district Unit Assessments.

Monitoring:

We will monitor and track student progress through iReady diagnostics and district Unit Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Sullivan (lisa.sullivan@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will work in CLPs and use the district instructional focus calendars to have a common understanding of standards, determine mastery, develop lessons, deliver lessons, review student work and assess student understanding. Teachers will deliver lessons that are to the full extent of the standard and use materials that are fully aligned and address each part of the standard. Flexible, small group instruction will occur based on student need.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Students need multiple exposure to standards and need direct instruction in relation to skills that they show deficiencies in.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1 Identify sub groups
- 2 Administer iReady Diagnostic
- 3 Develop small groups and instructional plans to provide differentiated, specific instruction to flexible groups
- 4 Progress Monitor
- 5 Review Data

Person Responsible

Lisa Sullivan (lisa.sullivan@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

DMMS ranks 465 out of 553 Middle Schools in Florida. DMMS reported 7.2 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all middle schools in the state, it falls into the very high category. A primary concern that will be monitored is OSS.

We have implemented grade level houses with a counselor/behavior interventionist, a dean, a team leader and an administrator. This implementation includes the physical location of personnel as well. The different grades are housed with their teams in different areas of the campus. This will allow teams more opportunities to meet and focus on student SEL, attendance and academics. This also allows students a greater access to the adults on campus. Teams will have regular meetings to discuss attendance, grades and social/emotional concerns.

Classroom locations and the master schedule were carefully selected and crafted to allow for minimal transitions and specific traffic patterns. This allows for an increase in supervision and less students in the hallways.

We will continue with our SEL initiative using Community Circles with 1st periods. Students return to their first period at the end of the day for Lion's Quest Lessons.

Single School Culture is evident through common expectations and procedures.

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.

DMMS has monthly SAC Meetings that involve local community members.

DMMS began implementing PBIS in the 2020 2021 school year with 6th grade. We have expanded our PBIS program to school wide this year.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

TBD

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00