

Seminole County Public Schools

Seminole High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Seminole High School

2701 RIDGEWOOD AVE, Sanford, FL 32773

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0181>

Demographics

Principal: Michael Pfeiffer

Start Date for this Principal: 11/3/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
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)	57%
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 (57%) 2017-18: B (56%) 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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Seminole High School

2701 RIDGEWOOD AVE, Sanford, FL 32773

<http://www.scps.k12.fl.us/schools/schoolinfopage.cfm?schoolnumber=0181>

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)
High School PK, 9-12	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

Our mission is to cultivate the potential in every student to thrive as a global citizen by inspiring a love of learning, encouraging civic engagement, challenging and supporting every student to achieve academic excellence, while embracing the full richness and diversity of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will achieve at his or her maximum potential in an engaging, inspiring and challenging learning environment.

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
Rodriguez, Jordan	Principal	Oversight of strategic planning, personnel selection and retention, strategic partnerships, mass communication, and the school budget.
Abney, Lance	Assistant Principal	Advanced opportunities, 1+, 2+, 3- students within 9th grade ELA and social studies
Coleman, Barry	Assistant Principal	Director of the IB Program. Advanced opportunities, 1+, 2+, 3- students within 10-12th grade ELA and Reading.
Nelson, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Advanced Opportunities, 1+, 2+, 3 - students within 10-12th grade Math; Master Scheduler, Graduation Rate, ESOL, Guidance Department.
Pitters, Marc	Assistant Principal	Advanced opportunities, 1+, 2+, 3 - students within 10-12th grade Science, oversees the Exceptional Student Education Department, Facilities Maintenance, MTSS
Washington, Jaime	Principal	Advanced opportunities, 1+, 2+, 3- students within 9th grade math and science, oversees Exceptional Student Education and MTSS at 9th Grade Center.
Kelley, Veronica	Other	Oversees Testing on the Main Campus (10th - 12th) grade. Media Center Operations, Inventory.
Prom, Shelly	Assistant Principal	Director of the Academy of Health Careers. Oversight of Advanced Placement; Advanced Opportunities within Performing and Visual Arts, World Languages, the SIP, serves as School Advisory Council representative.
DeCosta, Roy	Assistant Principal	Oversees Career and Technical Education Programs on the Main Campus, Summer School, Electives, ROTC, and Advanced Opportunities within the Social Studies Department.
Doherty, Courtney	Other	Oversees 12th Grade Discipline, Student Debt, Campus Clubs / Organizations, Student Activities, Field Trips, Clerical Supervisor

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 11/3/2019, Michael Pfeiffer

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.*

3

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

122

Total number of students enrolled at the school

4,143

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

26

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

5

Demographic Data

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				58%	63%	56%	58%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	51%	54%	55%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	43%	42%	37%	44%	44%
Math Achievement				44%	55%	51%	47%	56%	51%
Math Learning Gains				47%	49%	48%	39%	46%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	42%	45%	33%	38%	45%
Science Achievement				59%	73%	68%	58%	75%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				71%	78%	73%	76%	80%	71%

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
09	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	55%	1%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	53%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	61%	71%	-10%	67%	-6%

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	65%	75%	-10%	70%	-5%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	27%	61%	-34%	61%	-34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	51%	64%	-13%	57%	-6%

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 – Grade 9 & 10
- Mathematics – Grade 9 & 10 enrolled in Algebra and Geometry
- US History – Grade 11 – Common District Created Benchmark Assessments

In Biology, teacher based formative assessments were used for progress monitoring. Data is unavailable for these assessments.

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	572 67%	664 76%	736 79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	272 57%	325 66%	375 71%
	Students With Disabilities	51 37%	60 42%	84 51%
	English Language Learners	12 27%	19 61%	27 47%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	412 53%	399 49%	429 51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	220 47%	212 43%	233 46%
	Students With Disabilities	68 45%	52 34%	67 42%
	English Language Learners	14 36%	19 43%	21 42%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	291 55%	452 79%	355 82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	139 44%	251 72%	192 75%
	Students With Disabilities	17 28%	32 43%	23 40%
	English Language Learners	9 31%	19 66%	10 67%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	141 36%	129 30%	82 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100 34%	87 27%	61 26%
	Students With Disabilities	21 26%	22 26%	5 9%
	English Language Learners	19 42%	16 30%	5 14%
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	147 54%	216 78%	245 81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	97 49%	149 75%	166 77%
	Students With Disabilities	17 35%	31 61%	36 67%
	English Language Learners	8 32%	14 52%	19 73%

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	37	37	17	26	27	22	43		73	19
ELL	22	44	41	17	31	35	30	34		81	45
ASN	84	73	30	67	42		83	78		100	92
BLK	33	44	40	20	25	28	36	54		86	42
HSP	43	46	46	29	27	27	48	58		88	54

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	59	53	64	28	30		57	79		94	83
WHT	62	57	49	53	38	27	68	77		87	70
FRL	35	44	42	25	26	26	42	56		85	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	20	33	26	11	28	34	23	38		82	29
ELL	17	44	38	24	31	33	24	35		76	42
ASN	86	66	75	76	53		82	98		97	92
BLK	34	46	43	27	42	42	39	46		84	47
HSP	51	49	38	40	41	43	58	68		84	72
MUL	69	60	36	50	48	33	71	79		100	73
WHT	71	58	36	60	54	40	75	84		90	76
FRL	41	46	39	33	41	41	49	56		83	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	17	30	25	14	27	30	29	29		68	26
ELL	20	47	46	16	25	22	21	36		64	
ASN	90	74		81	61		84	97		100	98
BLK	36	41	30	28	28	22	39	57		84	50
HSP	52	51	46	46	36	37	57	73		84	76
MUL	66	64	36	52	33		63	75		94	65
WHT	67	58	41	60	46	43	69	85		90	74
FRL	42	45	37	34	32	29	45	66		78	54

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	83%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	40
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	69
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	41
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	48
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	61
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	60
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 and English Language Learners 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 and English Language Learners 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 and English Language Learners 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 9 ELA reflects 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 for students in grades 9-11 and grade 12 reading and in mathematics for students enrolled in Algebra 1, Geometry and Liberal Arts Math 1.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increasing academic achievement of students with disabilities and English Language Learners. 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: Jordan Rodriguez (jordan_rodriguez@scps.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
 See SCPS School Improvement Plan for additional details

Person Responsible Jordan Rodriguez (jordan_rodriguez@scps.us)

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.

Setting consistent school discipline. Establishing school norms that create and build values. Professional Developments. Getting parents involved more frequently. Creating traditions and classroom innovations that are fun for the students and teacher. Celebrating student's achievements and their positive behavior. Maintaining a positive physical school environment.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The entire teaching and administrative staff at SHS have been trained in Restorative Practices (RP). RP focuses on building solid relationships so that teachers-students and teachers-admin can repair any damage done and heal instead of holding a grudge. The 9GC has built in an advisement period daily in order to specifically facilitate the RP methodology. With teachers and administrators successfully using RP strategies we expect to see a 5% reduction in the number of disciplinary referrals for the 21-22 year.

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

Teachers and administrators have all been trained on the Restorative Practices model.