

Putnam County School District

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High 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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High School

901 STATE ROAD 100, Florahome, FL 32140

www.putnamschools.org/o/qi-roberts

Demographics

Principal: Joe Theobold

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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)	85%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Putnam County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Q.I. Roberts Jr. Sr. High School

901 STATE ROAD 100, Florahome, FL 32140

www.putnamschools.org/o/qi-roberts

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)
High School 7-12	Yes	63%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Putnam 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.

Q.I. Roberts Jr.-Sr. High School will provide high quality education for all students. The expectation is Excellence in all Endeavors.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Q.I. Roberts Jr.-Sr. High School will orient, educate, and graduate every student fully prepared for successful entry to and completion of a post-secondary education. Faculty and staff ensure student engagement and work collaboratively to create a respectful, positive learning environment where decisions are made in the best interest of students.

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
Theobold, Joe	Principal	Oversees and evaluates the performance of staff and students.
Thornton, Tammie	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in executing mission and vision of the school.
Bennett, Amanda	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Support teachers in implementing curriculum.
Dehart, Jana	Other	Coordinates the Cambridge program, including assessments and professional development for teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Joe Theobold

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

483

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

4

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

7

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	15	18	16	19	118	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	4	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	11	11	8	6	51	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	17	9	22	82	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	7	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	8	2	8	6	9	4	37

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	7	2	1	0	0	0	10	
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 9/15/2021

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	113	136	89	86	90	46	560	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	13	8	7	15	65	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	12	4	1	0	30	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	3	1	0	12	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	0	10	
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	2	0	6	3	2	0	13

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

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	113	136	89	86	90	46	560		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	12	13	8	7	15	65		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	12	4	1	0	30		
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	3	1	0	12		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	0	10		
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	2	0	6	3	2	0	13

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	
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 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				85%	31%	56%	85%	35%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	34%	51%	63%	46%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	27%	42%	62%	41%	44%
Math Achievement				71%	25%	51%	78%	38%	51%
Math Learning Gains				50%	43%	48%	56%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	42%	45%	64%	44%	45%
Science Achievement				83%	39%	68%	93%	50%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				93%	49%	73%	92%	55%	71%

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
07	2021					
	2019	81%	38%	43%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	88%	41%	47%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
09	2021					
	2019	83%	41%	42%	55%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
10	2021					
	2019	85%	41%	44%	53%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	54%	29%	67%	16%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	60%	33%	71%	22%
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	69%	49%	20%	61%	8%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	43%	30%	57%	16%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We use USA Test prep in Science and Civics, ALEKS in math, and STAR in ELA. These tests are not used in each grade as we are a Cambridge Magnet.

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79%		
	Economically Disadvantaged	83%		
	Students With Disabilities	47%		
	English Language Learners	0%		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55		
	Economically Disadvantaged	41		
	Students With Disabilities	25		
	English Language Learners	-		

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	79		
	Economically Disadvantaged	83		
	Students With Disabilities	47		
	English Language Learners	0		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58		
	Economically Disadvantaged	49		
	Students With Disabilities	17		
	English Language Learners	-		

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58		
	Economically Disadvantaged	49		
	Students With Disabilities	17		
	English Language Learners	0		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	58		
	Economically Disadvantaged	49		
	Students With Disabilities	17		
	English Language Learners	0		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	84		
	Economically Disadvantaged	68		
	Students With Disabilities	50		
	English Language Learners	0		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	--		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92		
	Economically Disadvantaged	100		
	Students With Disabilities	50		
	English Language Learners	0		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	-		
	Economically Disadvantaged	-		
	Students With Disabilities	-		
	English Language Learners	-		

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	82	73		50							
BLK	84	64	67	50	20		69	82	71		
HSP	86	71	64	50	27			90	71		
MUL	94	65		50	9						
WHT	82	56	56	68	20	23	80	90	76	100	100

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
FRL	86	62	67	65	24	25	88	86	77	100	100
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
BLK	73	55	61	58	42	33	71	86	70		
HSP	83	72	81	62	52		91		68		
MUL	85	69		80	80				82		
WHT	87	60	59	73	49	40	84	94	83	100	97
FRL	81	59	56	73	52	36	77	91	79	100	92
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
ASN	70										
BLK	69	62	50	67	63	62	82	92	75		
HSP	83	55	64	71	41		70		80		
MUL	82	82									
WHT	87	63	64	79	55	61	97	92	90	98	100
FRL	83	62	62	75	53	57	89	91	85	97	97

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	69
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	759
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	68
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Gains in lowest 25% in math have been a major concern year in and year out.

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

BQ Math

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

We have not spent a great deal of energy fixing this in previous years.

This year, we have intervention groups and devote time each day in regular math class to address this need.

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

We continue to show massive achievement success in ELA compared to District and State scores.

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

Our program is both heavy in reading and selective of students who have shown proficient reading skills.

We also have amazing teachers in our ELA department.

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

We need to continue a systemic approach to our math department, with better PD, planning, and follow-up as a department.

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.

We will continue to send teachers to specific AICE PD through Cambridge International.

We will provide AVID PD to help bridge the gap between Jr. and Sr. High School needs. Students in the lower grades are now getting explicit instruction in executive functioning and student success skills.

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

Using AVID as an anchor point in our lower grades provides us with a long term set of benchmarks and goals to use with students as they matriculate through our program.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Math bottom quartile will be our area of focus. It not only is the largest area for us to improve, but we see the effects over time as students have shown a 100 point gap between our ELA SAT scores and Math SAT scores.

Measurable Outcome: We will improve our BQ to 55% showing growth this year.

Monitoring: We will use iReady, ALEKS, and Observation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joe Theobald (j2theobald@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will use small group iReady instruction, ALEKS, and intervention time in class and at Power Hour.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have seen ALEKS and iReady work for students in other settings.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

We will use Laurens Kids curriculum to address all our SEL goals, especially working on our Vaping Issue.

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.

We use the Lauren's Kids curriculum for SEL and we have weekly and monthly mentoring in 7th period, called Knights Club.
We also have peer mentoring in our AVID classroom.

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

All faculty and staff play a role in making this a positive culture.
Specifically, all teachers with a 7th period teach the lessons and the counselor, Melissa Buquo, facilitates this learning.
We have a Graduation Coach, Karri Hodges, who is also a certified counselor and helps with these initiatives.
Our AVID Teacher, Amanda Lamb, has developed a mentoring program with her seniors who mentor the 7th grade students.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00