Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy

5803 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gastride Harigan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 6-9
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)	80%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)
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 Broward 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

Millennium 6 12 Collegiate Academy

5803 NW 94TH AVE, Tamarac, FL 33321

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School 6-9	Yes	59%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 Millennium 6-12 Collegiate Academy is to provide a stimulating and safe environment where each students' diversified needs are challenged and social needs are met creating productive citizens and lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision statement is S.T.A.R.S, where "Students are Soaring To Achieve Success" and become Career and College-Ready.

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
Baugh, Francine	Principal	
Satty, Paul	Assistant Principal	
Gayle, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Edun, Narissa	Assistant Principal	
Bagwell, Holly	Instructional Coach	
Schorr, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Dominique, Alexandria	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Gastride Harigan

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.*
5

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
82

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,417

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	387	388	384	69	63	61	65	1417
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	39	38	0	5	7	1	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	14	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	2	13	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	18	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	63	45	0	0	0	0	153

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	5	0	0	0	0	20

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	25	16	0	0	0	0	53
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated
Sunday 9/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	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	
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	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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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	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	

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				55%	58%	61%	54%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	58%	59%	56%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	52%	54%	48%	49%	52%
Math Achievement				57%	58%	62%	59%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains				50%	58%	59%	52%	56%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	51%	52%	50%	49%	52%
Science Achievement				44%	51%	56%	51%	52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				72%	74%	78%	69%	75%	77%

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	51%	57%	-6%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	47%	55%	-8%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison	-51%					
08	2021					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison	-47%					
09	2021					
	2019	97%	57%	40%	55%	42%
Cohort Comparison	-50%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	58%	58%	0%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison	-58%					
08	2021					
	2019	41%	45%	-4%	46%	-5%
Cohort Comparison	-38%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	27%	43%	-16%	48%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	67%	31%	67%	31%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%
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	77%	61%	16%	61%	16%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	56%	34%	57%	33%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

By grade level, Common Formative Assessments (Monthly) are used to monitor student retention of knowledge in all tested areas (ELA, Math/Algebra/Geometry, Social Studies and Science/Biology)

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9					
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency		Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students				
	Economically Disadvantaged				
	Students With Disabilities				
	English Language Learners				
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	19	33	31	17	21	20	13	33			
ELL	31	46	41	25	25	26	21	49	33		
ASN	68	51		68	28		63		64		
BLK	49	44	42	31	16	16	45	52	47		
HSP	51	49	43	33	24	30	40	57	51		

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
MUL	62	26		48	21		54	64	42		
WHT	60	56	44	42	22	13	63	40	61		
FRL	47	45	42	32	19	21	39	52	44		
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	21	37	31	17	39	42	5	43	50		
ELL	37	49	41	47	54	40	31	59	59		
ASN	80	67		88	66			70	92		
BLK	51	50	40	54	48	40	38	69	68		
HSP	54	54	41	55	51	45	47	80	67		
MUL	60	55		64	51	60	50	72	75		
WHT	68	59	47	69	55	46	63	79	78		
FRL	50	51	42	53	49	40	39	70	68		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	45	43	23	39	35	18	21	25		
ELL	25	48	49	39	48	47	21	61	46		
ASN	72	69		76	66		62		83		
BLK	50	53	49	56	51	49	46	67	79		
HSP	55	57	46	61	54	49	59	65	74		
MUL	66	64	58	67	42		78	63	83		
WHT	64	61	44	66	56	54	52	84	84		
FRL	49	53	47	55	52	51	45	66	76		

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	24
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	88%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	32
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	57
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	38
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	40
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	45
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	45
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	36
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Between 2018 and 2019 data on Students with Disabilities, ELA and Math achievement data reduced from year to year. However what did increase in Social Achievement Data within this same subgroup. This indicates to us that students with disabilities are acquiring content specific knowledge and not in the math skills and literacy strategies that are typically associated with Math and ELA achievement.

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

In 2019, students with disabilities (SWD) scored 21% in ELA achievement, which is a 1 point reduction from 2018 and an 8% reduction in learning gains. In Math achievement, SWDs reduced 6 points but maintained in learning gains. In science achievement, SWDs reduced 13% from 2019 to 2018 but increased 21% in social studies achievement.

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 believe that we need to increase our support for SWDs with increased use of literacy strategies in ELA and Science classrooms and provided more small group instruction with specified pull-out/push-in models for Math classrooms.

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

Students of other demographics are showing consistency and maintaining achievement levels, including Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial and White.

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

Between 2018 and 2019, our school changed our scheduling model by eliminating team scheduling. This type of scheduling limited instruction for students with varying learning capabilities because they were placed based on general overview of their assessment scores/teacher recommendation rather

than place students based on their assessment scores levels. Our school began to schedule students based on their identified scores and provided supportive intensive reading classes when necessary.

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

Pull-out and push-in models as well as provide teachers with more effective strategies in supporting students with disabilities, in ELA and Math classrooms as well as Science and Social Studies.

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.

Common planning periods for teachers who teach in tested areas, weekly professional learning communities focused on increasing student achievement, monthly common formative assessments to address student needs of improvement

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

Before and after-school tutoring in tested areas (FSA and EOCs), including advanced placement for high school studies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities achievement scores are statistically reduced over the last few years. It is the only ESSA subgroup in which we scored below 41%
Measurable Outcome:	Within the ESSA subgroup of Student with Disabilities, our school will increase achievement in all tested areas (ELA, Math, Science and Social Studies) by 3% and increase learning gains in ELA and Math by 5% points.
Monitoring:	Monthly Common Formative Assessment Results and Monthly Shared Best Practices within Professional Learning Communities and trainings provided on Professional Study Days
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alexandria Dominique (alexandria.dominique@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Within common planning periods, teachers will create Monthly Common Formative Assessment based on standards covered within a 3-week period. Students will be tested in week 4 or 5 and the results of these assessments will specifically identify Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners learning trajectory and trends. The results of these findings will be used to modify instruction and increase the use of literacy strategies and math skills in all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers common plan and collaborate on instructional strategies focused on increasing student learning growth, then the result is more targeted infusion of skills based on the data collected. Teachers can identify areas that need reteaching as well as areas of enrichment.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Student discipline in the 19-20 school year indicated that there were a total of 60 incidents document, with 10 incidents reported to law enforcement. Of the 60 incidents, 41 were related to fighting, an average of 2.63 fights per 100 students.

A primary area of concern is the disruptive unruly behavioral incidents that have lead to incidents such as fighting (minor, medium or major). Our school has re-imagined its discipline policy to include positive behavior support programs. Each classroom and hallway exhibits has posted of expected behaviors, each period of the day our teachers offer brain breaks to give our students a chance to relax and be creative, motivation strategies are offered by teachers as well as providing students with incentives for their positive/good behaviors such as assignment/ homework passes, extra credit points, etc. By encouraging positive behaviors rather than highlighting disruptive ones, our students know that they can receive and achieve more through good behavior.

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.

Our school motto encourages us to follow the STAR expectation in the Hallway, Cafeteria and Bus Area (which were the three areas outside the classroom with the highest disciplinary incidents):
-Be Successful: Holding high expectations for yourself and motivate yourself to try your best
-Be Tolerant: Understanding diversity in students and teachers
-Be Accountable: Taking responsibility and ownership of one's actions
-Be Respectful: Treating yourself and others with dignity and positivity

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

Our Positive Behavior Support Team includes the following individuals, aside from school administration:
Teachers: Lorain Morris, Farryn Weiss, Lisa Maceinri, Kimberly Baker, Julie Campbell, Holly Bagwell
Parent: Laquesta Pitts
Equity Liaison: Jennifer Schorr
Each team member meets monthly to discuss ways in which a positive culture can be fostered by teachers

and students as well as review school-wide data on rate of disciplinary incidents.

Our school also has a Starshine Committee, which promotes collaboration, comraderie and a positive culture by organizing staff events and providing encouragement in times of need. This is a teacher led committee.

We also have monthly Star Teacher of the Month in which staff nominates a teacher who goes above and beyond for our school, students and colleagues. This person is chosen and acknowledged by grade level.

Our principal also sends out a Star Weekly Newsletter including pictures and stories of what is going on in the classroom, highlighting lessons taught and student growth.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00