

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mulrennan 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	20

Mulrennan Middle School

4215 DURANT RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tamara Brooks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	51%
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 (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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	20

Mulrennan Middle School

4215 DURANT RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[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)
Middle School 6-8	No	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

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 Hillsborough 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.

To build positive relationships with our students, staff and community while providing a safe, caring and academically challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To have a successful middle school experience by providing a place to excel.

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
Brooks, Tamara	Principal	Middle School Principal: Hold self and others accountable for high academic achievement; conduct high-quality classroom observations identifying effective teaching practices; use data to prioritize instructional supports; recruit and retain high-quality staff; create a safe, positive environment for all stakeholders; create systems to accomplish school goals; identify and address inequities.
Rodgers, Linda	Teacher, K-12	6th grade ELA teacher; SAC Chair
Burnett, Beverly	Assistant Principal	Middle School Assistant Principal: Hold self and others accountable for high academic achievement; conduct high-quality classroom observations identifying effective teaching practices; use data to prioritize instructional supports; recruit and retain high-quality staff; create a safe, positive environment for all stakeholders; create systems to accomplish school goals; identify and address inequities.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Tamara Brooks

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.*

4

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

75

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,245

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

5

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

5

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	406	389	472	0	0	0	0	1267
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	81	95	0	0	0	0	262
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	18	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	55	57	0	0	0	0	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	62	60	0	0	0	0	171
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	8	6	11	0	0	0	0	25

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	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/5/2021

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	373	412	446	0	0	0	0	1231
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	82	88	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	5	0	0	0	0	28
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	55	43	62	0	0	0	0	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	46	43	0	0	0	0	156

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	4	9	3	0	0	0	0	16

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	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	13
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	373	412	446	0	0	0	0	1231
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	82	88	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	5	0	0	0	0	28
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	55	43	62	0	0	0	0	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	46	43	0	0	0	0	156

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	4	9	3	0	0	0	0	16

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	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	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%	51%	54%	66%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				56%	52%	54%	63%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	47%	47%	50%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				70%	55%	58%	68%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				66%	57%	57%	62%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	52%	51%	44%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				54%	47%	51%	60%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				81%	67%	72%	77%	66%	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	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	64%	54%	10%	52%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	73%	49%	24%	55%	18%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
08	2021					
	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	54%	47%	7%	48%	6%
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	79%	67%	12%	71%	8%

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	85%	63%	22%	61%	24%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

20-21 Achieve 3000 was used for ELA for all grade levels.

20-21 Baseline/Midyear Math/Science/Social Studies was used for all grade levels.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	25	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	15	20
	Students With Disabilities	22	40	43
	English Language Learners	0	0	7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33	52	
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	51	
	Students With Disabilities	68	64	
	English Language Learners	18	34	

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24	34	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	26	29
	Students With Disabilities	31	38	44
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56	52	
	Economically Disadvantaged	46	43	
	Students With Disabilities	63	52	
	English Language Learners	36	26	
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49	63	
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	54	
	Students With Disabilities	49	63	
	English Language Learners	26	21	

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	44	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	26	30
	Students With Disabilities	29	36	39
	English Language Learners	7	6	6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61	44	
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	36	
	Students With Disabilities	61	46	
	English Language Learners	43	31	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	57	59	
	Economically Disadvantaged	54	55	
	Students With Disabilities	64	52	
	English Language Learners	23	45	

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	30	21	24	29	24	20	45	62		
ELL	33	49	43	25	34	34	28	51	75		
ASN	65	59		50	50		57		73		
BLK	49	45	28	36	28	14	32	48	60		
HSP	52	46	37	47	43	30	45	66	72		
MUL	58	48	31	57	36	38	55	70	82		
WHT	67	55	32	65	50	46	60	82	82		
FRL	51	47	33	44	39	34	41	61	69		
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	19	34	34	23	45	41	12	46			
ELL	22	47	44	31	57	55	8	40			

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	81	55		83	70		58	80	90		
BLK	51	53	49	50	59	57	42	73	70		
HSP	56	56	47	63	64	51	52	73	85		
MUL	60	54	33	69	75	71	46	76	75		
WHT	69	57	39	76	66	52	60	87	87		
FRL	51	50	41	55	58	51	45	70	75		
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	36	24	33	22	22	48	71		
ELL	19	41	38	29	44	40	23	49	80		
ASN	81	59		83	71		67	90	93		
BLK	55	62	48	54	53	31	44	78	58		
HSP	56	59	48	58	57	44	46	72	85		
MUL	63	53	36	65	52	38	65	62	82		
WHT	74	67	53	75	67	50	69	80	90		
FRL	54	57	44	55	54	42	47	68	77		

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	54
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	43
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	59
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	49
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	53
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	47
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?

Bottom quartile students in ELA and Math made the lowest gains in 4 testing years (34% and 36% respectively)

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

7th grade math decreased 46 points (5 points below district average).

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

The majority of 7th graders took an advanced test, leaving 1/3 of the class to take the basic 7th grade test. 7th grade regular math core instruction is to be looked into.

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

8th grade math scores increased 31%

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

Students were accelerated into this math based on data.

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

Maintaining a strong core instruction (Tier 1) will accelerate learning. Small group differentiation will support those that need it at the right time.

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 Learning Communities will begin to look at current data trends to meet the needs of all learners.

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

Positive behavior incentives will be implemented. PLCs and walk-throughs will be used to identify model classrooms for in-house professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Teachers will engage in structured PLC's. This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on teacher input and FSA/EOC data results.

Measurable Outcome:

The number of bottom quartile students making gains for
 ~ ELA will increase from 34% to 45% or higher;
 ~ Math will increase from 36% to 50% or higher

Monitoring:

Teachers will work collaboratively in their PLC's to ensure all lessons are standards-based and that specific targets have been identified. Student data will be disaggregated and student needs will be identified based on common assessment results data. All students will be included and teachers will progress monitor and differentiate instruction according to individual student needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamara Brooks (tamara.brooks@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Structured PLCs

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will work collaboratively in their PLC's to ensure all lessons are standards-based and that specific targets have been identified. Student data will be disaggregated and student needs will be identified based on common assessment results data. All students will be included and teachers will progress monitor and differentiate instruction according to individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

PLCs will meet twice a month.
 They will follow the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle.
 SALs will work with DRTs to provide easy to follow forms and protocols to guide teachers through the cycle.
 Teachers will provide copies of their PLC logs to SAL and administration for review and feedback.

Person Responsible

Tamara Brooks (tamara.brooks@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the ELA and Math FSA 2021 data results.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students scoring a 3 or higher will increase
 ~in ELA from 60 to 63%
 ~in Math from 56 to 68%
 ~in Science from 52 to 57%
 ~Bottom Quartile ELA and Math will increase from 34 and to 45% and 50% respectively.

Monitoring: Teachers will work collaboratively in their PLC's to determine what will be done when the students do/do not achieve success on specific targets have been identified. Student data will be disaggregated and student needs will be identified based on common assessment results data. All students will be included and teachers will progress monitor and differentiate instruction according to individual student needs. ESSA Subgroup SWD will be monitored quarterly to close gaps from typical peers, especially those that fall within our bottom quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tamara Brooks (tamara.brooks@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Student engagement strategies from Kagan and Teach Like a Champion will be utilized

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies are used to keep students engaged, focused and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

- ~Data from PLCs will be reviewed at ILT monthly
- ~Recommendations will be made to support teachers as they differentiate lessons
- ~Model classrooms will be identified and utilized for in-house professional development.

Person Responsible Tamara Brooks (tamara.brooks@hcps.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.

According to the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org site, Mulrennan reported 4.6 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all middle schools statewide, it falls into the high category (statewide is 4.2). Mulrennan is implementing Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior Incentives to proactively correct behavior concerns. We have created a PBIS Committee that meets monthly to monitor behavior and discipline data and suggest ways to improve.

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 holds events in which parents and care-givers are encouraged to attend such as:

"Summer Bridge" for all incoming 6th graders.

Open House for all students/families

Quarterly conference nights

PTSA Sponsored events

Relay for Life events

Band/Orchestra concerts

AVID Events

Grade level incentives (field trips, awards, honor roll celebrations)

All announcements posted to website/ Parentlinks frequently made to all stakeholders.

PBIS Strategies and Incentives will be utilized.

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

Administration- set expectations, approve and delegate responsibilities.

Counselors- communication with individual families as it relates to behavior, academic and mental health.

Teachers- set class and grade level expectations; communicate with stakeholders via Canvas or in-person.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00