

The School District of Desoto

Desoto 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

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

<http://dms.desotoschools.com/>

Demographics

Principal: David Boland

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2021

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)	100%
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 is pending approval by the Desoto 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Desoto Middle School

420 E GIBSON ST, Arcadia, FL 34266

<http://dms.desotoschools.com/>

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Desoto 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.

The mission of DeSoto Middle School is to provide all students a positive learning environment focused on building relationships, high levels of student engagement and setting high expectations with academic rigor.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of DeSoto Middle School is to provide a positive school culture that is student-focused, promoting the development of the whole child and inspiring lifelong learners.

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
Jones, Damien	Principal	
Edsall, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
Holland, Carrie	Reading Coach	
Staples, Dan	Math Coach	
Moreno, Babette	Other	
Moxley, Susan	Other	
Keller, Rebecca	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/15/2021, David Boland

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,001

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

8

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

10

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/2/2021

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	365	330	313	0	0	0	0	1008
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	11	21	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	37	53	0	0	0	0	144
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	92	69	78	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	80	0	0	0	0	227

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	270	251	237	0	0	0	0	758

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
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	365	330	313	0	0	0	0	1008
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	11	21	0	0	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	37	53	0	0	0	0	144
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	92	69	78	0	0	0	0	239
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	80	0	0	0	0	227

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	270	251	237	0	0	0	0	758

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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
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				35%	35%	54%	36%	36%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				46%	46%	54%	50%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	40%	47%	50%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				36%	36%	58%	37%	37%	58%
Math Learning Gains				38%	38%	57%	51%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	32%	51%	50%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				30%	30%	51%	29%	29%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				46%	46%	72%	47%	47%	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	33%	32%	1%	54%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	29%	29%	0%	52%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
08	2021					
	2019	40%	40%	0%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	37%	36%	1%	55%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	34%	33%	1%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
08	2021					
	2019	9%	8%	1%	46%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	30%	29%	1%	48%	-18%
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	44%	43%	1%	71%	-27%
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	87%	40%	47%	61%	26%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	39%	-39%	57%	-57%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring data represented for reading and math comes from STAR testing during the 2020-21 school year for all grade levels. Benchmark assessments for science and civics are used to progress monitor students.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25	29	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	26	27
	Students With Disabilities	14	11	13
	English Language Learners	6	7	7
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42	55	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	55	51
	Students With Disabilities	23	35	33
	English Language Learners	26	47	42

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	23	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	21	19
	Students With Disabilities	10	3	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	33	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	36	32	33
	Students With Disabilities	10	20	18
	English Language Learners	14	14	27
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	7	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	8	16
	Students With Disabilities	0	8	0
	English Language Learners	0	11	5

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19	20	17
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	20	17
	Students With Disabilities	3	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31	35	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	35	27
	Students With Disabilities	12	17	7
	English Language Learners	6	16	8
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	7	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	7	13
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

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	12	23	24	16	21	19	9	41			
ELL	25	35	34	20	17	32	3	33			
BLK	28	30	27	18	21	18	20	27			
HSP	32	34	24	28	23	27	19	36	62		
MUL	40	45		26	21						
WHT	38	42	38	32	32	26	37	51	75		
FRL	29	33	28	22	22	23	22	32	68		
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	16	40	31	17	30	28	17	35			
ELL	15	40	38	26	37	39	18	23	69		
BLK	26	41	39	21	29	27	15	41			

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	32	46	44	36	39	34	30	41	82		
MUL	32	56		15	21						
WHT	40	46	34	41	41	30	33	53	81		
FRL	29	45	40	31	35	29	24	43	76		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	38	37	17	45	45	13	31			
ELL	5	38	51	14	36	45	4	18			
BLK	13	41	40	13	35	38	9	28			
HSP	35	48	53	38	50	53	29	46	80		
MUL	38	65		21	52		25				
WHT	43	54	51	42	56	55	36	53	72		
FRL	31	48	49	33	48	50	25	43	73		

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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	11
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	327
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	23
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	24
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	30
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	33
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	41
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	29
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?

Trends show that grade levels score consistently below state averages. In 2019, DMS average below state averages in ELA, Math, and Science by an average of 21%. In 2021, DMS scored an average of 20% in ELA, Math, and Science. When looking at 2019 subgroup data, ELL and SWD students had lowest rate of proficiency in all grade levels in ELA and Math. In 2019, DMS had six(6) subgroups score below the federal index.

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

While an increase in proficiency is needed across all grade levels, ELA and Science show as the areas of greatest concern. As far as subgroups are concerned, SWD and ELL students, are viewed as those students of greatest need.

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

Low levels of expectations and rigor contribute to low performance. High expectations campus-wide and more rigorous course work will inevitably increase student achievement.

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

6th grade ELA showed the greatest grade level improvement on FSA data from 2019 to 2021. Math scores show the most consistent proficiency levels and slight improvement when analyzing progress monitoring data.

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

N/A

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

Strategies include a focus on developing lesson plans using Marzano strategies, analyzing student placement to ensure learning, and development of acceleration tracks to increase rigor.

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.

Professional development opportunities will include sessions on how to create lesson plans utilizing research-based strategies to increase learning, creating common assessments, and analyzing student data to identify areas of need.

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

N/A

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: PBIS will be implemented in an effort to create a positive culture and environment. In 2021, there were a total of 1745 referrals, an increase of 383 referrals, while having 28 less students enrolled.

Measurable Outcome: The goal is to decrease the total number of referrals by 10%.

Monitoring: Monthly discipline data will be monitored by administrative team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Timothy Edsall (timothy.edsall@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS Implementation, including school-wide discipline plan developed for consistency across all grade levels, and creation of a positive culture.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS strategies are research-based and proven to help initiate a positive culture on school campuses.

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS implementation in stages and development of school-wide discipline plan.

Person Responsible: Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Analysis of monthly PBIS data and identifying trends. Incentives will be developed centering around trends.

Person Responsible: Timothy Edsall (timothy.edsall@desotoschools.com)

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

Six(6) subgroups are below the Federal Index of 41%. Subgroups include SWD, ELL, African American, Hispanic, Multiracial, and Economically Disadvantaged.

Measurable Outcome:

Our goal is to obtain 41% proficiency for our ESSA subgroups.

Monitoring:

Area of Focus will be monitored utilizing classroom walkthroughs by administrative team. Teachers will be given immediate feedback daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Walkthroughs will focus on implementation of Marzano strategies. There will also be a focus on Checking for Understanding and Student Engagement. Implementing these strategies will significantly impact our ESSA subgroups, by focusing on the quality and depth of instruction. Once instruction is given, teachers will focus on levels of student understanding and how to re-teach. Walkthroughs will be scheduled by administration.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Classroom walkthroughs are a transformative tool which will provide meaningful data to support teachers and student achievement. Walkthroughs are an effective way for instructional leaders to play an active role in generating focused, qualitative data to inform schoolwide improvement efforts.

Action Steps to Implement

Formatting lesson plans utilizing Marzano strategies for effective instruction.

Person Responsible

Carrie Holland (carrie.holland@desotoschools.com)

Analyzing course placement of students, ensuring placement is correct based on assessment scores, or other defined criteria.

Person Responsible

Rebecca Keller (rebecca.keller@desotoschools.com)

Daily walkthroughs monitoring implementation of effective instructional strategies including, checks for understanding, implementation of Marzano strategies, and student engagement.

Person Responsible

Damien Jones (damien.jones@desotoschools.com)

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.

Looking at school data, in comparison to state-wide data, secondary areas of concern are incidents of threat/intimidation and disruptions on campus. By implementing PBIS effectively, it will help the school focus on these two areas, which directly affect school culture and environment. The school will produce three-year comparison data, which will help identify trends that need attention. PBIS implementation will be a fluid process, as the needs of the school are ever-evolving, based on data.

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.

The school currently address building a positive school culture environment by focusing on the basics of positive behaviors and habits. School-wide expectations have been established for students and staff. In regards to the students, the acronym B.I.T.E. has been created to remind students of the characteristics needed to represent our student body, Be respectful, Initiate kindness, Take responsibility, and Enthusiastic learning. Students will be offered incentives for exhibiting desired behaviors, which is as the core of PBIS. By

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

Teachers will be instrumental to this process as they will model for students on what these behaviors look like by being welcoming students, building relationships, and delivering deliberate praise. Teachers will also communicate with with parents and ensure that parents are allowed to play a part in the education of their student(s), which develops a bridge between home and school. Administration will model these behaviors as well by being supportive of teachers, communicating effectively, and being proactive problem solvers.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00