

The School District of Lee County

Gulf 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	21

Gulf Middle School

1809 SW 36TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33914

<http://gfm.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: James Moreland

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
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 (64%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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	21

Gulf Middle School

1809 SW 36TH TER, Cape Coral, FL 33914

<http://gfm.leeschools.net/>

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	No	64%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

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 Lee 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.

Gulf Middle School will provide a world-class education; defined by high-expectations and real-world experiences by way of a safe and nurturing environment that fosters well-informed and educated contributing members of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gulf Middle School envisions every student reaching their highest potential by encouraging the value in life-long learning and an appreciation for what success looks like in an ever-changing global economy.

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
Moreland, James	Principal	
Toadvine, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Winfield, Emma	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, James Moreland

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

837

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

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

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	261	274	302	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	32	56	0	0	0	0	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	19	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	8	11	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	12	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	38	51	0	0	0	0	120
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	50	61	0	0	0	0	150
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	36	38	55	0	0	0	0	129

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	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	243	281	264	0	0	0	0	788	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	8	0	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	6	0	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	7	2	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	32	32	0	0	0	0	93	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	25	0	0	0	0	91	

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	25	35	20	0	0	0	0	80	

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	

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	243	281	264	0	0	0	0	788	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	8	0	0	0	0	29	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	14	0	0	0	0	32	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	6	0	0	0	0	26	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	7	2	0	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	32	32	0	0	0	0	93	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	33	25	0	0	0	0	91	

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	25	35	20	0	0	0	0	80	

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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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				62%	55%	54%	65%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	56%	54%	61%	54%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	44%	47%	49%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				76%	64%	58%	74%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains				73%	64%	57%	72%	63%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	54%	51%	65%	54%	51%
Science Achievement				59%	50%	51%	69%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	70%	72%	69%	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	61%	52%	9%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	59%	51%	8%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
08	2021					
	2019	60%	57%	3%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	75%	57%	18%	54%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2021					
	2019	78%	60%	18%	46%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	59%	46%	13%	48%	11%
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	72%	67%	5%	71%	1%
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	94%	59%	35%	61%	33%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	102/47.4	128/54.5	137/55.9
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.6	2/9.1	2/8.7
Mathematics	English Language Learners	1/6.3	3/17.6	3/15.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	81/37	109/46.6	125/51.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.3	1/4.5	2/8.7
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	2/11.1	2/11.8

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	92/57.9	106/61.8	108/61.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	1/5.9	1/5.6
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/12.5	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	116/46.8	156/57.1	161/59
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	3/9.1	4/11.4
	English Language Learners	1/7.7	4/26.7	3/20
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	159/60.9	209/73.9	223/76.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/50
	English Language Learners	6/42.9	7/38.9	8/44.4

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	31/60.8	35/63.6	34/66.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.8	3/13.6	3/15
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	138/60.5	167/63.7	176/68.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/10	4/16.7	5/23.8
	English Language Learners	2/25	4/33.3	5/38.5
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	113/45.2	144/55	173/65
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/5.3	3/13.6	3/14.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/16.7	2/15.4

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	14	32	33	16	37	33	20	25			
ELL	29	57	53	41	61	61	21	38			
ASN	84	69		94	63		80				
BLK	44	34	31	44	53	44	45	56			
HSP	60	65	49	59	54	54	63	64	66		
MUL	70	38		73	76		77	91			
WHT	64	59	44	66	56	46	68	76	71		
FRL	55	54	45	57	51	40	64	66	65		
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	14	38	34	35	50	43	13	28			
ELL	42	53	39	63	73	67	33	53			

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
ASN	75	75		100	75						
BLK	45	38	18	52	42	17		60			
HSP	54	55	47	72	75	71	48	70	68		
MUL	59	52		59	67						
WHT	67	59	30	80	74	62	67	80	73		
FRL	52	52	36	68	69	59	44	63	60		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	31	29	29	57	54	19	43			
ELL	43	63	54	50	54	41		46			
ASN	100	80		90	60						
BLK	53	55	50	57	78	88	75				
HSP	59	59	47	66	65	58	56	60	65		
MUL	64	68		68	64	50					
WHT	69	63	51	79	75	67	74	73	70		
FRL	57	55	45	66	69	66	61	56	62		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	51
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	596
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	71
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	61
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	54
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?

Our progress monitoring data showed growth from 2019 state assessment data across grade levels and core content areas. However, SWD and ESOL subgroups showed inconsistent progress.

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

Based on progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, the SWD subgroup showed the greatest need for improvement across 6th and 7th grade ELA and math content areas.

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

Changing instructional models contributed to this need for improvement. All students are on campus this year to be able to provide more instructional support.

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

Based on progress monitoring data and 2019 state assessments, ELA showed the most improvement across grade levels.

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

ELA went from a single block to double block course to provide increased instructional time.

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

Ongoing use of high-yield instructional strategies such as distributed summarizing and numbered heads together.

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.

Ongoing professional development in high-yield instructional strategies and data analysis will be provided to support a high level of instructional rigor.

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

A dean of students has been added to allow for increased administrative support in core instructional areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELA consists of 3 of the 9 components of the school grade calculation.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on progress monitoring data, our goal is to achieve 5% growth across grade levels from Baseline to Quarter 3 testing windows.

Monitoring:

Growth in student achievement will be monitored throughout each progress monitoring period.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

High-yield instructional strategies focusing specifically on distributed summarizing and numbered heads together will be used to increase student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

These high-yield strategies have the highest affect size percentage in achieving student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided on an ongoing basis to support instructional implementation of high-yield strategies.

Person Responsible

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Math consists of 3 of the 9 components of the school grade calculation.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on progress monitoring data, our goal is to achieve 9% growth across grade levels from Baseline to Quarter 3 testing windows.

Monitoring:

Growth in student achievement will be monitored throughout each progress monitoring period.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

High-yield instructional strategies focusing specifically on distributed summarizing and numbered heads together will be used to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

These high-yield strategies have the highest affect size percentage in achieving student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided on an ongoing basis to support instructional implementation of high-yield strategies.

Person Responsible

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

Acceleration consists of 1 of the 9 components of the school grade calculation.

Measurable Outcome:

Based on state assessment data, our goal is for 68% of students enrolled in Algebra 1 will achieve a 3 or higher on the end-of-course assessment.

Monitoring:

Student growth will be monitored by progress monitoring data to determine if we are on track to meet our goal for the end-of-course assessment.

**Person responsible
for monitoring
outcome:**

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

**Evidence-based
Strategy:**

High-yield instructional strategies focusing specifically on distributed summarizing and numbered heads together will be used to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

These high-yield strategies have the highest affect size percentage in achieving student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development will be provided on an ongoing basis to support instructional implementation of high-yield strategies.

Person Responsible

James Moreland (jameswmo@leeschools.net)

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.

Our primary concern for the upcoming school year will be focused on property incidents. Our goal is to reduce the number of property incidents in half during the upcoming school year. Our PBIS team will provide positive behavioral strategies as well as monitor behavior and discipline 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.

Marzano's High Reliability levels is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs and leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

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

Faculty, teachers, students, parents, and community members are stakeholders in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Leading indicators for stakeholders in promoting a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration are as follows: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The

fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers.

Part V: Budget

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

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