

St. Lucie Public Schools

Lincoln Park Academy



2022-23 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	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lincoln Park Academy

1806 AVENUE I, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lpa/>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Herrington

Start Date for this Principal: 8/24/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (67%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (69%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Lincoln Park Academy

1806 AVENUE I, Fort Pierce, FL 34950

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/lpa/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	No	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Lincoln Park Academy is to ensure that all students graduate from our safe and caring school, and are equipped with knowledge, academic skills and the desire to succeed as life long learners and positive contributors to our diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lincoln Park Academy will be a premier college preparatory secondary school that prepares all students for post-secondary placement through challenging, engaging, and satisfying work that enables every student to continuously improve in all academic areas. Teachers will work together collaboratively as part of a dynamic community engaged in learning and designing quality work for students. The curriculum will require annual mastery of the core academics and will provide elective subjects to enhance student development. A partnership will exist with parents and the community, that fosters citizenship, self-reliance, and character development.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sanabria, Henry	Principal	
Stone, Candace	Assistant Principal	
Octavi, Lynda	Assistant Principal	
Poole, Hilary	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/24/2022, Michelle Herrington

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

79

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,611

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

18

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

13

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	281	253	251	208	212	186	180	1571
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	68	54	53	51	65	61	403
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	31	19	19	9	9	3	131
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	24	16	9	32	12	4	103
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	40	15	24	1	3	104
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	55	49	13	12	17	6	208
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	70	65	14	30	20	4	283
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	40	40	0	3	3	5	139

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	82	74	71	34	37	31	14	343

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	284	276	258	218	220	189	200	1645
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	52	44	26	29	28	35	257
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	17	18	7	6	2	1	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	31	42	23	38	14	7	179
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	18	58	39	35	15	3	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	54	36	16	27	13	0	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	57	54	41	31	3	2	263
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	30	8	0	0	1	0	64

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	69	69	64	45	47	21	6	321

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	1	7	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

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	284	276	258	218	220	189	200	1645
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	52	44	26	29	28	35	257
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	17	18	7	6	2	1	70
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	31	42	23	38	14	7	179
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	18	58	39	35	15	3	191
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	54	36	16	27	13	0	190
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	57	54	41	31	3	2	263
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	30	8	0	0	1	0	64

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	69	69	64	45	47	21	6	321

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	1	7	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	67%	46%	51%				75%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						64%	48%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						51%	36%	42%
Math Achievement	55%	37%	38%				70%	40%	51%
Math Learning Gains	52%						62%	41%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						54%	38%	45%
Science Achievement	70%	29%	40%				82%	71%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	43%	48%				83%	68%	73%

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	2022					
	2019	68%	51%	17%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	75%	49%	26%	52%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2022					
	2019	73%	54%	19%	56%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	58%	47%	11%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	78%	50%	28%	54%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2022					
	2019	16%	34%	-18%	46%	-30%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	48%	24%	48%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	71%	22%	67%	26%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	67%	15%	71%	11%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	85%	68%	17%	70%	15%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	73%	51%	22%	61%	12%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	80%	55%	25%	57%	23%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	27	34	27	21	32	24	29	43			
ELL	41	47	37	30	43	39	31	41			
ASN	88	81		83	69		94	100	100	100	100
BLK	54	55	47	40	48	44	51	74	77	100	71
HSP	72	59	44	54	48	36	74	72	78	100	84
MUL	74	61		79	71		67	92	93	100	83
WHT	75	65	60	68	57	55	81	85	85	100	78
FRL	57	53	41	42	47	39	58	68	78	100	76
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	29	37	29	24	26	17	40	38		100	75
ELL	30	31	17	26	23	22	25	29			
ASN	91	73		89	58		95	95	87	100	100
BLK	56	53	36	38	27	25	54	64	77	100	82
HSP	66	54	27	51	30	25	59	76	64	98	91
MUL	87	63		69	34		80	75	100		
WHT	72	60	40	63	37	30	80	82	80	100	88
FRL	60	52	34	43	31	26	59	68	71	100	81
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	30	43	38	39	53	50	50	63	35		
ELL	32	61	55	37	46	50	31	57			
ASN	95	87		97	65		96	94	76	100	100
BLK	63	58	46	54	57	48	67	72	64	100	68
HSP	80	67	65	71	58	59	83	90	59	100	89
MUL	83	66		69	67	45	82		67		
WHT	77	63	48	79	67	59	90	86	56	99	67
FRL	68	60	51	63	58	52	76	76	60	100	70

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	772
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%
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%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	91
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	80
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Overall, there appeared to be significant increases across all core content areas. However, there were slight decreases in 6th and 8th grade ELA, as well as in 8th grade Math. As for subgroups, the two groups most negatively impacted were our ELL and SWD.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math Proficiency.

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

Learning loss due to the pandemic. Daily attendance plays an integral part in ensuring students are receiving instruction, to include ensuring there is a qualified teacher in front of students to deliver the instruction. By hiring a literacy coach and math interventionist, we can ensure that both teachers (ELA/Reading) and students needing math interventions will get the support they need to continue making learning gains and ultimately becoming proficient.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The component that had the biggest gain was the learning gains for mathematics.

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

We addressed this area strategic scheduling and employment of interventions by the assigned Math Interventionist through push-in and pull-out.

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

The first focus will be on students who have been in the same level 1 bucket for the past two testing years in mathematics (i.e. 1.1 - 1.1, 1.2 -1.2, and 1.3 - 1.3). These students have been identified and will be pulled for Tier 2 intervention. The second focus will be on those students who dropped out of proficiency in ELA. Once a literacy coach is hired, he/she will work closely with the ELA and Reading teachers to look at instructional strategies within the classroom.

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.

The primary means of PD will be through collaborative learning and planning (CLP's), whereby teachers meet weekly to collaborate on data analysis and lesson planning, evaluation of lesson taught and reflection. Other areas of PD will be based on needs identified by the teachers themselves.

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

For the next two years, the assigned Math Interventionist will work closely with students who have not yet met proficiency in all grade levels. The newly implemented State Progress Monitoring Test will assist in helping to identify areas of deficiency prior to the Spring Test. This will assist math teachers and interventionist in targeting specific areas of need, which will be addressed through push-in and pull-out services.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Continue working toward increasing ELA proficiency, Learning Gains and Bottom 25% Learning Gains to where we were in SY 2019.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase proficiency level from 67% to 72%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored through progress monitoring using Achieve 3000 for all grades (MS/HS) and both the district unit assessments and state progress monitoring tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Candace Stone (candace.stone@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The use of the literacy coach will focus on support of the ELA and Reading teachers. In addition, the use of CLP meetings and data chats will allow us to focus on Tier 1 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The Wallace Report on Leadership clearly indicates that "Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school." Hiring the right person who will focus on supporting teachers is key in that it can have a profound impact on the students they teach.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Literacy coach will create a schedule and plan to meet with identified teachers and student groups for small group intervention.

Person Responsible

Candace Stone (candace.stone@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Continue to increase proficiency and maintain Math Gains. The rationale being over the last year, math has continued to increase progressively across proficiency (+3), Learning Gains (+19) and Bottom 25 LG (+17). Ultimately, we want to continue the positive momentum.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to bring the scores back to the levels of the of the 2019 school year. Moving proficiency to 60% from 55%, Learning Gains to 57% from 52% and Bottom 25 Learning Gains to 49% from 44%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress towards this goal will be monitored through unit assessment data, formative and summative classroom assessments, and the new progress monitoring tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hilary Poole (hilary.poole@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our math interventionist will focus on working with Tier 2 and Tier 3 students to achieve gains. In addition, the use of CLP meetings and data chats will allow us to focus on Tier 1 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Weekly CLP meeting and data chats are a schoolwide and district expectation.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Math interventionist will teach three intensive math blocks and create a plan for pulling Tier 2 student groups for additional small group intervention.

Person Responsible

Hilary Poole (hilary.poole@stlucieschools.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

The school works at building positive relationships with families through the many opportunities for parental involvement, including academic, athletic, social, and performances. Parents are contacted regarding specific student conduct, student achievements, as well as ongoing communication about student progress. Parents are also encouraged to participate in parent groups which are actively involved in the school. We will also capitalize on building a positive school culture and environment through implementation of single school culture, the new iSucceed Classroom Management initiative, maintaining a focus on the social, emotional and well-being of our students and staff, while maintaining a "Student-Centered" approach.

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

Overall, all faculty and staff are stakeholders in promoting a positive culture and environment. Specifically, the PBIS Team is tasked with identifying ways to increase the culture and environment at the school. In addition, those teachers who facilitate SEL also have a prominent role in this. Finally, the School Advisory Council (SAC), plays in critical role by supporting the school's high expectations and providing input in key areas such as student achievement.