Jefferson High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Brittney Wilhelm

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (51%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%)
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

Jefferson High School

4401 W CYPRESS ST, Tampa, FL 33607

[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)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	92%

School Grades History

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

Jefferson High School will provide the educational services, support, and caring environment needed to enable every student to become a productive citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Jefferson High School Student will graduate with the skills and tools necessary for a successful life.

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
Wilhelm, Brittney	Principal	
Cannon, Bernard	Assistant Principal	
Amos, Shawn	Instructional Coach	
Cooper, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	
Pines, Dana	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/27/2022, Brittney Wilhelm

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.*
0

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.*
23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
62

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,327

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
21

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
19

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	0	0	0	396	330	321	280	1327
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	108	103	117	462
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	87	82	58	332
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	38	38	0	89
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	100	77	51	344
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	58	64	52	265
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	16	15	2	54

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	0	0	0	185	156	154	156	651

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	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 7/14/2022

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	0	0	0	359	375	323	342	1399
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	179	182	164	709
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	53	60	42	215
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	0	0	0	55	98	71	81	305
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	0	0	129
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	0	0	0	52	41	76	40	209

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	359	375	323	342	1399
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	184	179	182	164	709
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	53	60	42	215
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	0	0	0	55	98	71	81	305
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	69	0	0	129
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	0	0	0	52	41	76	40	209

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	40%	52%	51%				45%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						48%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%						33%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	39%	39%	38%				37%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	47%						40%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						37%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	48%	46%	40%				62%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	49%	48%				71%	75%	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

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

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	61%	66%	-5%	67%	-6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	68%	73%	-5%	70%	-2%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	23%	63%	-40%	61%	-38%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	45%	57%	-12%	57%	-12%

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	16	29	30	30	38	30	18	37		85	24
ELL	27	42	43	34	55	37	32	61		87	61
BLK	28	38	34	30	44	44	39	55		92	34
HSP	43	45	39	41	47	49	49	71		89	52
MUL	53	33		46							
WHT	52	50		56	61		72	78		84	58
FRL	36	43	37	35	47	50	44	64		89	47
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	18	35	41	14	26	33	56	49		87	7
ELL	25	46	44	15	29	35	52	55		92	58
BLK	32	37	30	13	14	21	51	52		96	26

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
HSP	45	46	41	20	21	31	67	74		93	55
MUL	25	42								90	
WHT	50	42		41	29		77	77		85	57
FRL	37	40	34	18	19	28	59	65		93	45
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	11	23	20	23	32	19	32	41		86	34
ELL	20	45	42	31	36	48	35	44		83	63
BLK	37	38	27	26	33	31	57	58		89	41
HSP	46	51	37	39	42	43	61	76		90	54
MUL	59	44		25				90		85	82
WHT	69	62		65	68		85	89		89	51
FRL	43	46	33	33	37	36	57	70		89	51

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	51
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	44
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	64
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	49
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?

ELA achievement and science both had declines as a school. Math and social studies either maintained or showed growth as a school.
SWD students trend down in ELA Achievement, Social Studies, and Science. SWD students showed growth in mathematics.

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

Steady decline in ELA Achievement data from 46.4% in 2017 to 39.5% overall. SWD students at Jefferson score 6.5% below the district SWD average in ELA Achievement.
SWD achievement in science decrease from 56% to 17% this school year. Our science scores for the school decreased by 13%, from 63.5% to 48.4%.

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

Lack of effectiveness in PLCs for science impacted the overall effectiveness in this subject. Attendance concerns impacted continuity of learning. Procedures for effective PLCs, support from district leaders in planning and curriculum.

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

Overall math achievement increased 20% but still remained 13% below the district average. SWD students scored 2% higher than the district SWD average in math achievement.

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

Effective PLC structures that included planning for common assessments and common lesson structure. Remediation plans developed as a department.

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

Planning for standards-based lessons. Implementing PLC Structure focused on standards and progress monitoring. Utilizing common assessments to analyze student achievement.

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.

Monthly Professional Development time will be set aside for Instructional Leadership Team to training faculty on lesson structures. PLC training occurred during Pre-planning and will structure for district support is in place for each tested subject.

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

Department Heads will work with their content supervisors to support their leadership and the growth of the department. Extended Learning Program structure has been updated to analyze standards and remediate students based on student data.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	SWD students are performing significantly below their counterparts in ELA and Science. SWD students score 15.7% in ELA, where the entire population scores 39.5%. SWD Students score 17.5% in Science, where the entire population scores at 48.4%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	SWD students will increase by 5% in both ELA Achievement and Science Achievement.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ESE Support Facilitation to pull small group will be used in both ELA and Science in the Master Schedule. Subgroup data will be pulled for both subject and analyzed by tradition and support facilitation teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	ESE Support Facilitators will utilize small group support in both ELA and science. These instructors will pull struggling students to reteach low standards from the traditional classroom. Students will receive this support in addition to their classroom lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Small group support for students with SWD has an effect size of .47. According to Hattie, this indicates learning extends beyond that which is expected just from attending school.

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.	
Ensure that master schedule supports SWD students having access to ESE Support Facilitators in tested subjects.	
Person Responsible	Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)
Pair Support teachers will content area teachers for planning during PLC.	
Person Responsible	Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)
Identify needs of SWD students through IEP to schedule them appropriately.	
Person Responsible	Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)
Create support structure for teachers to discuss needs of SWD students in the classroom.	
Person Responsible	Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Steady decline in ELA Achievement data from 46.4% in 2017 to 39.5% overall. Our science scores for the school decreased by 13%, from 63.5% to 48.4%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	ELA and Science achievement will increase by 10% overall.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teachers will participate in PLC meetings. Each meeting is focused on either common assessment data trends or assignments that meet the level the standard dictates. Reviewing Progress Monitoring data to plan for student instruction around standards that test low. ELP will used to continue to remediate the standards that are low performing for students. Teacher will work within their departments to break down standards and align their lessons.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Our strategy of focusing on standards in instruction has an effect size of .75 on teacher clarity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	John Hattie indicate significant effect size of .75 on Standards aligned instruction.

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.

Standard based assessment of students will occur through PM testing to increase Student readiness for the post secondary level.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

PLC time provided to teacher within their work day.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

PLC training provided to staff during Pre-planning.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Standards support provided by district supervisors for each tested subject.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Progress Monitoring Testing scheduled for each class for data analysis.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Common assessments planned as a team to support student learning.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Extended Learning Program offered to student and teachers to assist in remediation.

Person Responsible   Brittney Wilhelm (brittney.wilhelm@hcps.net)

Reading coach will support data analysis and planning for ELA.

Person Responsible   Shawn Amos (shawn.amos@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Parents involvement will be encouraged throughout the year through the Student Advisory Committee.

Person Responsible   Brittany Cooper (brittany.cooper@hcps.net)

Parent involvement will be encouraged and communicated through ELP.

Person Responsible   Brittany Cooper (brittany.cooper@hcps.net)

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.

Jefferson has created a culture committee comprised of teachers. This committee will help to monitor the overall climate of the school and plan celebration activities to boost culture. SAC committee is 30 members. These members are teachers, parents, and students. Active participation in monitoring the school environment will be encouraged through positive contact with the SAC Chair. A full time Climate and Culture Resource Teacher is tasked with providing support to the students and staff for positive school culture. Student Government will have an active role in encouraging student and staff to participate in school spirit activities. We have implemented the Dragon Award to recognize departments throughout the year. We are bringing back the Distinguished Dragon Award to recognize students who are working hard in school.

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

Climate and Culture Resource Teacher - Mary Frietas - manages positive school culture through planned activities and serving as liaison for the culture committee.
SAC Chair - Brittany Cooper - manages positive parental connection through SAC meetings.
SGA Teacher - Constance Scott - manages school spirit activities and the Student Government Association.
PTSA - Joel Reagan - manages parental involvement and support through PTA