Markham Woods Middle School

leadership
analysis
Florida
college and career
students
mission
ambitious
family and community involvement
school improvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
needs assessment
success
resources
areas of focus
instruction
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning
supportive environment
growth

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Markham Woods Middle School

6003 MARKHAM WOODS RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0731

Demographics

Principal: Jason Mcdonald

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2021

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)	52%
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 (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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 Seminole 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

Markham Woods Middle School

6003 MARKHAM WOODS RD, Lake Mary, FL 32746

http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0731

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	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

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 Seminole 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.

Markham Woods Middle School staff must support a wide variety of student backgrounds, needs and obstacles. We meet that challenge through a highly skilled and dedicated staff with a team mentality and a care for every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To increase the achievement of all students in a safe and supportive learning environment—through a culture of excellence, collaboration, and continuous improvement—with the explicit intent of closing the achievement gap.

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
Johnson, Craig	Principal	School Leader
Basilo, Eric	Assistant Principal	Support School Leader
Bradley, Yvonne	Assistant Principal	Support School Leader
Boza, Maegan	Dean	Student Support
Barberino, Peter	Assistant Principal	Support School Leader
Garret, Mallory	Other	Student Support
Bernard, Allyson	Instructional Coach	Instructional Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/1/2021, Jason Mcdonald

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.*
2

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

61

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,039

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

11

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

8

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	390	328	316	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	2	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	25	3	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	33	27	0	0	0	0	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	68	57	34	0	0	0	0	159
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	76	42	0	0	0	0	217
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	34	30	5	0	0	0	0	69

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	69	61	16	0	0	0	0	146
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 8/31/2021

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	338	372	343	0	0	0	0	1053
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	11	18	7	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	36	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	41	53	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	90	84	0	0	0	0	269
	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	9	18	17	0	0	0	0	44

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	45	44	34	0	0	0	0	123
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	338	372	343	0	0	0	0	1053
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	11	18	7	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	36	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	41	53	0	0	0	0	128
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	90	84	0	0	0	0	269
	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	9	18	17	0	0	0	0	44

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	45	44	34	0	0	0	0	123
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				63%	61%	54%	61%	60%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	57%	54%	54%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	45%	47%	39%	43%	47%
Math Achievement				62%	66%	58%	68%	66%	58%
Math Learning Gains				54%	64%	57%	65%	64%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	52%	51%	39%	48%	51%
Science Achievement				61%	59%	51%	63%	62%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	75%	72%	73%	74%	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	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	62%	58%	4%	52%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	56%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	58%	65%	-7%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	60%	61%	-1%	54%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	18%	32%	-14%	46%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	0%	71%	-71%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	71%	74%	-3%	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	82%	61%	21%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Common District Created Benchmark Assessments were utilized to progress monitor:
• ELA – Grades 6-8
• Mathematics – Grades 6-8 including high school Algebra and Geometry
• Science – Grade 8
• Civics – Grade 7

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	172/71%	153/60%	176/77%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/52%	59/48%	67/62%
	Students With Disabilities	9/24%	10/24%	13/41%
	English Language Learners	3/17%	3/18%	2/67%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	168/70%	160/63%	198/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/58%	58/46%	92/65%
	Students With Disabilities	12/34%	16/38%	23/52%
	English Language Learners	5/36%	5/31%	11/61%

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	209/79%	214/77%	245/90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/46%	74/63%	85/79%
	Students With Disabilities	17/40%	18/38%	85/79%
	English Language Learners	6/46%	5/38%	1/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	195/74%	186/69%	204/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60/57%	61/55%	69/50%
	Students With Disabilities	18/43%	21/48%	20/40%
	English Language Learners	6/46%	6/50%	6/43%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	236/89%	184/68%	202/68%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79/75%	46/41%	54/44%
	Students With Disabilities	28/65%	15/33%	12/27%
	English Language Learners	6/50%	0	2/18%

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	230/84%	198/71%	242/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/64%	74/63%	85/79%
	Students With Disabilities	14/40%	18/38%	24/59%
	English Language Learners	10/59%	6/38%	4/80%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	198/66%	201/76%	212/67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/48%	70/56%	77/53%
	Students With Disabilities	6/27%	7/29%	5/19%
	English Language Learners	5/36%	6/43%	9/50%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	201/72%	66/38%	209/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/51%	62/49%	71/49%
	Students With Disabilities	4/18%	0	3/11%
	English Language Learners	5/33%	5/38%	7/37%

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	8	26	25	15	31	27	4	26			
ELL	37	53	55	38	40	30	20	29			
ASN	84	81		88	75		94	96	100		
BLK	34	41	29	31	36	27	38	33	61		
HSP	52	59	45	50	47	37	39	56	60		
MUL	65	47		63	41		69		92		
WHT	72	61	33	77	68	40	68	83	87		
FRL	42	49	35	41	40	31	38	42	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	18	29	30	21	33	30	14	24	20		
ELL	24	52	56	30	53	51	13				

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	85	78		89	80		78	89	93		
BLK	40	40	35	36	41	36	31	48	59		
HSP	47	53	43	44	50	47	45	64	60		
MUL	61	48		73	62	30	74	77	100		
WHT	78	62	50	76	58	42	76	87	81		
FRL	41	44	37	39	44	40	38	51	57		
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	24	38	30	29	40	31	30	27	45		
ELL	24	41	31	32	52	42		21			
ASN	79	74	45	90	83		79	83	86		
BLK	34	39	31	39	44	29	29	49	62		
HSP	45	44	36	52	54	43	51	53	57		
MUL	71	59		70	75			94	80		
WHT	76	63	55	84	76	47	79	89	83		
FRL	40	44	32	45	49	35	42	54	57		

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	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	92%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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	39
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	88
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	37
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	50
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	63
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	65
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	44
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?

The performance of students with disabilities across all grade levels and content areas is a concerning trend.

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

The achievement and learning gains of students with disabilities demonstrates the greatest need for improvement.

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

Factors contributing to the low performance of students with disabilities in ELA and Math proficiency and learning gains include disruption in instructional continuity due to the pandemic that further widened gaps in students' foundational skills. Actions to support improvement in these areas will include frequent formative progress monitoring with target support and acceleration in identified areas of need.

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

Grade 6-7 ELA and Grade 6 mathematics reflect the most improvement.

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

Deliberate monitoring of specific student groups contributed to this improvement. Actions included focus on the monitoring of the lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students along with standards-based tutoring

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

Acceleration strategies will include strategic monitoring of lowest 30% of students, acceleration of high level 1 and high level 2 and level 3 students, more frequent common formative assessment to gather progress monitoring data and highly structured professional learning community discussions using this data to collaborate on strategies to accelerate student learning.

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 will be focused on the development of highly effective professional learning communities and how school-based leaders can foster the growth and development of teacher collaboration for student success.

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

Additional services dedicated to student acceleration include social emotional learning support for students and families, data driven tutoring and acceleration support, expanded use of SCPS early warning tracking and MTSS based support, and additional progress monitoring opportunities in ELA and mathematics for all students in grades 6-8.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities. ESSA Federal Percent of Points Index indicates this is a high priority need and focusing on the success of these students will reduce achievement gaps and prepare these students for future academic success.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase achievement and learning gains for students with disabilities.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walk throughs, review of progress monitoring data and through data chats with professional learning communities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Craig Johnson (craig_johnson@scps.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lessons aligned to Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity with ongoing feedback loops between leadership and teachers, students and teachers and student with students and PLCs focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based lessons differentiated to meet the needs of these specific student groups and data driven deliberate action planning will improve achievement and learning gains for our students. This strategy is aligned to having high expectations for all learners and teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Student owned progress monitoring
Low 30% Monitoring
High Level 1 and High Level 2 Monitoring
Low Level 3 Acceleration
Collaborative Data Driven PLCs
Tutoring
See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible	Craig Johnson (craig_johnson@scps.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.

Through our PBIS systems, our Leadership Team will increase positive student interaction and provide consistent discipline support for students and staff.

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.

Through our PBIS initiative, our Mustangs Dare to DREAM! (Do Your Best, Respect Others, Engage in Learning, Always Be Positive and Manage Yourself). Our PBIS Team builds in opportunities for students to earn Mustang Bucks for exhibiting the DREAM expectations. These bucks can be used for rewards as well as entrance to school dances and other activities. Further, SPIRIT theme says have been scheduled once a month to built culture. Finally, positive student experience stems from a teacher focus on student achievement. Our teachers will individualize instruction and provide intervention based upon student need.

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

Admin, teachers, PTSA, SAC, West Side Community Center, My Brother's Keeper Program, Dividends, Dr. Tina Calderone are all stakeholders that will promote Markham Woods' positive culture and experience.