
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Turkey Creek Middle School

5005 S TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Donald Peek

Start Date for this Principal: 3/22/2021

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (43%)
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	21

Turkey Creek Middle School

5005 S TURKEY CREEK RD, Plant City, FL 33567

[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	Yes	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

School Grades History

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

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.

School Mission- Empowering students today, to make informed choices tomorrow, so they are better prepared for the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

School Vision- Successfully educating all students.

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
Dorray, Jason	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader for the school Supports Social Studies Department Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal
Simmons, Kristie	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach Works with staff to identify data sources to promote strategic instructional support for students Provides Instructional Coaching Cycles Provides PD opportunities to improve teacher practice that will enhance student achievement
Peek, Donald	Principal	Oversee the implementation and fidelity of areas of focus Work with District to determine school needs and PD opportunities centered around school's area of focus
Rowehl, Jaclyn	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader for all departments Supports the PLC process for Language Arts and Reading Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal
Prokop, Nicole	Other	Oversees the RTI/MTSS Process Supports the PLC process for Electives Instructional Coaching as needed Assumes all other responsibilities determined by the Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 3/22/2021, Donald Peek

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

65

Total number of students enrolled at the school

938

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

9

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	346	273	319	0	0	0	0	938
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	77	100	0	0	0	0	230
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	37	44	0	0	0	0	90
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	23	18	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	35	14	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	58	92	0	0	0	0	212
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	66	80	0	0	0	0	212
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	9	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	20	24	0	0	0	0	47

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	15

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	275	286	332	0	0	0	0	893
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	93	99	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	11	0	0	0	0	35
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	70	87	85	0	0	0	0	242
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	81	75	0	0	0	0	233

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	5	5	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	24	29	0	0	0	0	74

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	275	286	332	0	0	0	0	893
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	93	99	0	0	0	0	272
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	11	0	0	0	35	
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	70	87	85	0	0	0	242	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	81	75	0	0	0	233	

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	5	5	0	0	0	0	19

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	2	3	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	24	29	0	0	0	0	74

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				34%	51%	54%	34%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				42%	52%	54%	43%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	47%	47%	37%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				45%	55%	58%	41%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				44%	57%	57%	49%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	52%	51%	50%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				29%	47%	51%	29%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				59%	67%	72%	52%	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	35%	53%	-18%	54%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	32%	54%	-22%	52%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	30%	53%	-23%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	42%	49%	-7%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	52%	62%	-10%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2021					
	2019	11%	31%	-20%	46%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	26%	47%	-21%	48%	-22%
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	57%	67%	-10%	71%	-14%

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	76%	63%	13%	61%	15%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Baseline/Midyear Assessment
Achieve 3000

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	15	15	16
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	13	13
	Students With Disabilities	15	16	18
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	44	48	
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	47	
	Students With Disabilities	46	46	
	English Language Learners	23	13	

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	17	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	13	14	15
	Students With Disabilities	28	26	28
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	43	
	Economically Disadvantaged	23	38	
	Students With Disabilities	43	49	
	English Language Learners	30	23	
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	41	31	
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	28	
	Students With Disabilities	41	31	
	English Language Learners	25	7	

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		13	18	22
	Economically Disadvantaged		12	16	20
	Students With Disabilities		18	18	22
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		43	46	
	Economically Disadvantaged		43	46	
	Students With Disabilities		47	41	
	English Language Learners		25	16	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		32	32	
	Economically Disadvantaged		30	29	
	Students With Disabilities		30	25	
	English Language Learners		6	6	
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	16	25	19	19	24	29	12	31			
ELL	17	28	24	22	30	29	6	33	69		
BLK	12	17	21	8	28	38	6	35			
HSP	27	33	25	30	35	29	17	39	64		
MUL	38	31		46	54						
WHT	44	43	24	45	46	45	35	68	79		
FRL	28	33	22	30	35	31	19	40	65		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	36	35	29	38	33	16	44	20		
ELL	11	33	36	22	34	31	5	34	65		
BLK	38	47	54	45	49	46	27	78			

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
HSP	27	39	38	37	40	34	19	46	78		
MUL	44	57		59	69						
WHT	48	47	32	58	51	45	48	84	66		
FRL	31	40	39	42	43	37	26	55	70		

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	32	30	22	40	40	8	32			
ELL	12	30	30	21	41	47	13	31	43		
BLK	32	55	42	36	54	65	19	67			
HSP	25	38	32	33	45	46	20	41	65		
MUL	55	60		53	58						
WHT	52	50	50	55	55	55	44	70	68		
FRL	31	43	37	37	47	50	26	49	63		

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	34
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	12
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	27
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	21
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	31
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	42
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	48
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	32
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?

Data trends show that student gains are consistently below 50%. Our ELL students perform significantly lower than their peers in the progress monitoring tools.

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

The lowest three performing groups within the state assessment are Students with Disabilities, ELL, and Hispanic.. Our ELL students are significantly lower when utilizing our progress monitoring tools.

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

A major contributing factor is a lack of understanding of rigorous instruction aligned with grade level standards. Utilize Instructional coaching and collaboration through PLCs to strengthen the understanding of rigorous grade level standard instruction and provide appropriate scaffolds to support learning.

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

2019 assessment - Civics performance increased by 7%.. Math showed significant increase through the use of progress monitoring tools

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

Math began to have data chats with individual students. PLCs focused on improving student achievement through differentiation.

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

PLCs will begin to utilize common assessments to identify standards that need to be accelerated. Teachers will utilize the resources provided by the District to begin accelerating individual student learning with appropriate scaffolds to support 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.

PD on the Inquiry Cycle utilized in PLCs. District Coaches will work with departments on utilizing the resources for curriculum guide and acceleration. Instructional Coaching will be provided to teachers identified needing support.

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

Walkthroughs, Individual Leadership support for each department, PLCs focused on teacher and student learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Utilizing the 5 Why's Protocol, we identified that rigorous instruction was not happening in the classrooms. Instruction was not always aligned with grade level standards. There is a need for understanding what rigor and high expectations are when designing lessons aligned to grade level standards. With inconsistent access to rigorous instruction and regular practice with grade appropriate standards-aligned text and lessons, our three ESSA subgroups--SWD, ELL, Hispanic--are not making adequate academic growth.

Measurable Outcome: The achievement level for all students will increase from (3%) in ELA, (3%) in Science, and (3%) in Math on the Spring FSA assessment administered in May 2022.

Monitoring: Each member of the leadership team will support a specific department. The member of the leadership team along with the SALs will conduct weekly walkthroughs to identify trends. All trends will be shared with the ILT team on a monthly basis. The leadership team, along with the ILT will begin to identify teachers of mastery and also teachers that may need support through instructional coaching.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Donald Peek (donald.peek@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Visible Learning by John Hattie. Collective teacher efficacy has a positive correlation to student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing ongoing professional development through whole group faculty meetings and PLCs with regular follow up and accountability measures will promote the understanding of grade level standard alignment. Working our teachers through the PLC inquiry cycle will help identify students that may need additional support and assist teachers in spiraling standards into future lessons.

Action Steps to Implement

Engage staff in professional development on professional learning communities and use of an inquiry cycle to improve student learning and teacher practice.

Person Responsible Kristie Simmons (kristie.simmons@hcps.net)

Weekly walkthroughs utilizing the four principles of effective instruction by designated leadership team member to identify grade level standard alignment and use of teacher-led small groups to accelerate student learning.

Person Responsible Donald Peek (donald.peek@hcps.net)

Weekly reflection on walkthrough data to identify trends, needed resources and supports, and professional development to impact teacher and student learning.

Person Responsible Donald Peek (donald.peek@hcps.net)

PLC data analysis and intentional planning of teacher-led small groups to monitor progress of ESSA subgroups--SWD, ELL, Hispanic.

Person Responsible Donald Peek (donald.peek@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.

Turkey Creek's rank was Very High when compared to all middle/junior high schools related to incidents per 100 students. Turkey Creek ranks Very High in regards to Violent Incidents on campus. This generated an area of concern to focus on building respect among our students and staff. We have revamped our PBIS to include recognizing students that show respect towards their peers. We are implementing Restorative Practices to assist students in recognizing how their behavior affects themselves and others. We have hired an RTI Specialist to assist in monitoring the behavior and discipline of our students. Students that have multiple incidents will be identified early and strategies will be utilized to help students be successful in school. Through these measures we will minimize our incidents across campus.

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 priority is to strengthen the positive perception and culture of the school by cultivating relationships with all school stakeholders. A collaboration of increased parent involvement and strengthening the PBIS, will promote a learning environment that will begin to close learning gaps. We will conduct a school wide poverty training, Establish a routine to recognize students and staff each week that promote a positive culture environment. Send parentlink out monthly communicating to parents everything that will be happening for the month.

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

Administration - recognize our students and staff that promote a positive culture

Parent and Family Engagement Liaison - Communicate with parents and community regularly and assist parents with identifying barriers to support student learning

Student Success Coach - Monitor the PBIS. Work individually with a case load of students to promote positive behavior.

Sunshine Committee - Creates activities for staff to strengthen morale

ILT will provide a quarterly survey to students and staff to keep a pulse of the culture of the school and offer suggestions on how to improve identified areas of concern.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00