Centennial Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Rick Saylor R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/13/2021

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)	74%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Pasco 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

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us

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	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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 Pasco 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.

Centennial Middle School creates a STEM/LATIC culture of excellence; a safe and friendly school with a challenging curriculum where all students receive a world-class education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Centennial Middle School provides a world-class STEM/LATIC education for all 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
Saylor, Rick	Principal	
Morris, Sharon	Assistant Principal	
Wolff, Jeff	Assistant Principal	
Carroll, Scotty	Instructional Coach	
Roberts, Kristin	School Counselor	
Price, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Switzer, Jessi	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/13/2021, Rick Saylor R

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
610

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
3

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	188	212	198	0	0	0	0	598
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	35	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	34	37	0	0	0	0	110
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 FSA ELA assessment	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	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	91	63	0	0	0	0	203
Level I on 2019 Statewide FSA ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	69	62	0	0	0	0	198
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	54	72	58	0	0	0	0	184

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 7/13/2021

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	179	203	201	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	14	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	38	49	0	0	0	0	105
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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failures in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	53	64	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 Statewide ELA or Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	66	62	0	0	0	0	191

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	39	54	52	0	0	0	0	145

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
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	179	203	201	0	0	0	0	583
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	14	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	38	49	0	0	0	0	105
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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failures in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	53	64	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 Statewide ELA or Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	66	62	0	0	0	0	191

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	39	54	52	0	0	0	0	145

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	2	0	0	0	0	2
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				42%	52%	54%	39%	50%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	55%	54%	39%	50%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	47%	47%	29%	41%	47%
Math Achievement				46%	60%	58%	42%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				50%	61%	57%	48%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	51%	47%	53%	51%
Science Achievement				44%	52%	51%	46%	51%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				56%	68%	72%	63%	69%	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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	52%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2021					
	2019	49%	58%	-9%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	19%	42%	-23%	54%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	68%	-14%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	48%	-4%
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	55%	70%	-15%	71%	-16%	
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	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%	

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

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	11	26	20	10	30	33	10	27			
ELL	12	20	11	19	25	22		41			
BLK	17	38	39	15	43	44	17				
HSP	34	35	16	39	33	30	39	49	27		
MUL	55	48		43	55		90				
WHT	48	47	39	43	42	46	49	66	37		
FRL	33	37	28	33	36	40	36	49	28		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	13	39	40	19	38	35	19	27			
ELL	8	38	40	19	35	37		24			
BLK	20	36	38	24	33	38		24			
HSP	37	50	41	39	47	44	42	49	56		
MUL	48	58		52	46						
WHT	48	55	41	53	55	44	49	66	56		
FRL	35	47	39	39	45	41	37	49	53		
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	8	26	28	15	41	41	15	41			
ELL	17	32	29	18	38	44		27			
BLK	16	37	44	27	44	35	20				
HSP	35	38	30	36	45	45	47	56	59		
MUL	27	41		32	32						
WHT	44	39	24	47	52	53	51	69	37		
FRL	32	36	29	37	47	48	41	55	43		

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	43

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	91%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	21
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	25
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	30
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	35
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	58
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	46
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	37
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?

92.11% of students on-track for discipline.
Student failures from 1st to 2nd quarter decreased in multiple areas (ELA: 6th, 7th, and 8th grade), (Math: 6th, 7th, and 8th grade), (Science: 6th and 7th grade), and (Social Studies: 6th and 8th grade).
NWEA Testing Data (Avg to High) remained pretty consistent in ELA from Fall to Winter (62% - 59%).
30.76% of students were off-track for course performance in Q2.
Student failures in 8th grade Science increased from 1st to 2nd quarter (10.47% to 18.78%) and in 7th gr Civics (15.90% to 18.91%).
NWEA Testing Data (Avg to High) dropped for Science (76% to 67%)
NEWA Testing Data (Avg to High) dropped for Math (50% to 44%)
SWDs: Strengths of Note: Increase in Math learning gains and L25% learning gains from 2018 to 2019 by 8% and 19% respectively. Gaps to Address: Our ELA and Science performance stayed the same and dropped respectively. EWS Risk Ratios (Course 1.52 and Discipline 2.62)
FRL/ED: Strengths of Note: Science performance has increased in overall performance and learning gains. EWS Risk Ratios in appropriate ranges (Course 1.18 and Discipline 0.95) Gaps to Address: ELA performance has dropped.
ELL/LEP: Strengths of Note: Increase in ELA and Math achievement from 2018 to 2019. Gaps to

Address: ELA learning gains have dropped from 2018 to 2019, as well as a decrease in Math learning gains for students in the lowest quartile. Risk rations in Course (1.66)

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

Black: Strengths of Note: Math and Science data has increased, risk ratios in Course and Discipline in appropriate ranges. (1.15 and 0.79) Gaps to Address: Black/504 risk ratios in discipline (13.51 {one student})
Hispanic: Strengths of Note: Dramatic increase in Science and Social Studies performance. Increase in ELA learning gains. Gaps to Address: Decrease in ELA and Math performance.

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

The current conditions related to the pandemic.

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

92.11% of students on-track for discipline.
The amount of student failures from 1st to 2nd quarter decreased in multiple areas (ELA: 6th, 7th, and 8th grade), (Math: 6th, 7th, and 8th grade), (Science: 6th and 7th grade), and (Social Studies: 6th and 8th grade).
NWEA Testing Data (Avg to High) remained pretty consistent in ELA from Fall to Winter (62% - 59%).

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

Teacher interventions, STORM Center time, Reinforcing high-level Standards-Based instruction

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

Enrichment activities within the 5 E's Learning Plans

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.

Summer 5 E's Learning Plan Refresher

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

Storm Center Intervention and Enrichment groups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will implement rigorous, standards-based, STEM-infused learning activities into their 5 E's Learning Plans.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve FSA Scores by 10% (ELA, Math, Alg I, Civics, and Science), Improve FSA Learning Gains by 10% (including Lowest 25%) IPG Overall Results 1. Core Action 1: 85% 2. Core Action 2: 75% 3. Core Action 3: 60%
Monitoring:	Classroom Walk-Throughs (School-based and District) Common Formative Assessments NWEA Assessment Data Student Work
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	5 E's Learning Plans
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Providing students with STEM-infused Standards-Based Learning Activities to improve achievement

Action Steps to Implement

5 E's Learning Plan implementation (at a deeper level including extension and enrichment
learning activities)
Increased student choice in regard to learning activities on the 5E's Learning Plan
STEM activity per Learning Plan
Relevant and engaging STEM Challenges/ALU Tasks
Rigorous-standards based learning activities
Purposeful facilitation and Tier II supports

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students and staff will increase in their engagement levels through a variety of collaborative structures.
Measurable Outcome:	Gallup scores Staff Engagement: 4.13, Student Engagement: 4.00, Student Hope: 4.31 Increased number of points distributed by staff to students
Monitoring:	Weekly and Monthly PBIS Reports Friday Feedback (weekly feedback forms to staff) Student Leadership Team Meetings (monthly)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jeff Wolff (jwolff@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To improve the culture of the school for staff and students

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Other specifically relating to Data-Driven Decisions	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 2021-22 school year positive Tier I, II, and III supports will be in place to support students in increasing their academic achievement and behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of students who are on-track (academics and behavior) by 10%
Monitoring:	Monthly monitoring of EWS data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS and School Intervention Teams
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Effective at helping improve student engagement, student achievement, and student behavior.

Action Steps to Implement	
Implementation of PBIS Rewards for students	
Person Responsible	Jeff Wolff (jwolff@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Establish School Intervention Teams (meeting norms, procedures, and schedules)	
Person Responsible	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Administration meets weekly to monitor discipline data and to take corrective actions as needed.
School uses Title I funds to hire an additional Instructional Assistant for Student Discipline
SBLT monitors EWS data monthly
Discipline/PBIS Committee meets to monitor data and make suggestions to improve
SEL implemented into teacher lesson plans
Classroom Guidance
Small Group Counseling

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.

Student Leadership Board
Principal's Panel (student representative group)
PBIS Rewards Program
Student Activities
School Counseling Program (classroom, group, and individual)
School Spirit Days
Start with Hello Week
Suicide Prevention Week
Student Congress
Peace Day
Unity Day
World Kindness Day
Stop Bullying Week
Red Ribbon Week
See Something Say Something Week
Random Acts of Kindness Week
Incorporating SEL into teacher lesson plans

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

All staff are engaged in helping to create and maintain a positive school culture and enviroment.