Hill Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Hill Middle School

5200 EHRLICH RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Ronald Mason

Start Date for this Principal: 4/19/2015

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
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: B (57%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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 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

Hill Middle School

5200 EHRLICH RD, Tampa, FL 33624

[no web address on file]

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	86%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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.

Hill Middle School will prepare all students to achieve their fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Use respect, responsibility and relationships to foster student achievement.

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
Mason, Ronald	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 4/19/2015, Ronald Mason

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.*
26

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.*
20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
46

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,005

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
4

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	328	312	363	0	0	0	0	1003
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	78	95	0	0	0	0	240
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	23	44	0	0	0	0	98
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	17	36	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	28	20	0	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	63	110	0	0	0	0	249
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	68	100	0	0	0	0	233
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	21	15	0	0	0	0	37

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	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/31/2022

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	217	211	212	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	71	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	9	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	7	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	52	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	81	60	0	0	0	0	197
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	4	32	22	0	0	0	0	58

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	12	27	31	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	217	211	212	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	64	71	0	0	0	0	179
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	9	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	15	7	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	45	57	52	0	0	0	0	154
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	81	60	0	0	0	0	197
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	4	32	22	0	0	0	0	58

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	12	27	31	0	0	0	0	70
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	49%	50%	50%				59%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	49%						60%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						53%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	54%	36%	36%				65%	55%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%						67%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						58%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	52%	53%				53%	47%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	58%	58%				81%	67%	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	2022					
	2019	56%	53%	3%	54%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	56%	54%	2%	52%	4%
Cohort Comparison	-56%					
08	2022					
	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison	-56%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	50%	49%	1%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	54%	9%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
08	2022					
	2019	41%	31%	10%	46%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

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	51%	47%	4%	48%	3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	78%	67%	11%	71%	7%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	96%	63%	33%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%

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	15	33	32	17	40	44	7	65			
ELL	30	41	37	33	46	42	17	71	83		
ASN	77	72		84	85		70		100		
BLK	39	48	35	37	56	62	17	68	92		
HSP	44	48	40	50	57	54	34	77	77		
MUL	49	51		51	66	58	21	88	90		
WHT	58	49	39	63	63	57	49	88	82		
FRL	41	47	45	47	55	55	31	77	81		
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	14	23	19	20	31	28	21	25			
ELL	32	47	45	36	41	31	24	43	88		
ASN	59	72		72	55		62	75	88		
BLK	35	34	31	42	61	41	22	48			
HSP	45	42	31	51	46	35	39	58	85		
MUL	51	34	33	49	36	33	44	75	82		
WHT	57	52	51	67	57	47	52	78	83		
FRL	43	43	36	48	46	33	39	57	80		
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	16	40	38	21	53	54	11	55			
ELL	25	51	55	38	55	48	31	60	79		
ASN	77	66		84	80		71	95	93		
BLK	42	53	48	48	66	69	36	84	95		
HSP	52	58	53	59	65	52	44	72	90		
MUL	70	58		77	64	64	75	85	100		
WHT	69	65	58	74	69	66	67	91	95		
FRL	52	57	49	58	65	55	48	77	90		

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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	81
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	50
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	53
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	59
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	61
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	55
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?

The area of focus is to improve student proficiency in ELA for all students indicated by the 2021-2022 FSA ELA. There will be emphasis on increasing student proficiency for the subgroup Students With Disabilities (SWD).

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

We intend to increase student proficiency in ELA from 49% to 54%. Additionally, the Students With Disabilities (SWD) subgroup will increase to proficiency level.

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 identification of the SWD, or Students With Disabilities subgroup being below proficiency level for the Federal Index Report Card. Proper placement in Master Schedule of students in the subgroup SWD. Intentionally provide additional tutoring and assistance through school ZAP period and ELP funds. Additional training for proper instructional practices for this subgroup.

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

Civics achievement increased by 17 points on FSA EOC.

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

Enhanced PLC process with implementing protocol and scheduled PLC. Master Schedule common planning time by subject areas.

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

Enhanced PLC strategies focusing on subject area data and analysis of that data.

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 with implementing PLC A and PLC B processes effectively. School-wide teacher talent developers with a focus on small-group instruction. Interdisciplinary lessons/literacy trainings to provide teachers with a knowledge and resources needed to implement in classrooms.

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

School-wide teacher talent developers with a focus on small-group instruction and data analysis.

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 Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Science SSA results dropped 6 points from 2021 to 2022. 2021 Science SSA results were 43. 2022 Science SSA results were 37.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Overall Science SSA achievement will increase from 37 points to 42 points.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring PLC implementation, as well as, using data analysis from Baseline, Mid-Year, and Formative. Analyzing data to design instruction.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PLC implementation with focusing on interdisciplinary communication and content development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If interdisciplinary content and strategies are intertwined this will allow for greater learning gains for understanding all content areas.

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.

"Summer Extravaganza" began data analysis and discussions on what specifically is needed to reach academic goals.

Person Responsible	Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)

PLC implementation focusing on data analysis from the Baseline, Mid-Year, and Formative Assessments, as well as, teacher collaboration.

Person Responsible	Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)

Formal training with instructional staff concerning ESE strategies and methods for improving performance. Whole-school training by instructional leaders.

Person Responsible	Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)

Data tracking system to identify areas of focus. PLC's for focus on analyzed data, and addresses needs through instructional collaboration.

Person Responsible	Ronald Mason (ronald.mason@hcps.net)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

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.

Intentional school-wide focus on clarifying school-wide procedures, policies, and expectations.
All stakeholders providing consistency with school-wide procedures, policies, and expectations.
Intentional activities to connect all stakeholders with goal-driven student success (Example: Learner Profile, "The Baggage We Carry", and other connection practices in the classroom).
PBIS - Pawsitive Praise and Positive Referral (recognizes students for proper behavior and good citizenship).
Promoting positive physical and mental health through Humana/Go 365
Sunshine Committee

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

Daniel Westgate - Wellbeing 4U Champion
Kim Willis - Sunshine Committee Chairwoman
Administration - Connection Activities for all Stakeholders
Administration - Clarity of school-wide procedures and expectations.