

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Plant City High School



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

Plant City High School

1 RAIDER PL, Plant City, FL 33563

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Traci Durrance

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%)
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

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

Plant City High School

1 RAIDER PL, Plant City, FL 33563

[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	67%

School Grades History

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

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.

We are committed to working together to provide opportunities for our students to grow academically and socially to prepare them for life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pride, Accountability, Respect.

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
Sullivan, Susan	Principal	Facilitate and implement the Instructional Leadership Team, ensure data analysis and support all school personnel in school goals and action steps.
Smith, Lana	Assistant Principal	Develop a system for monitoring and managing SIP goals. Facilitate the collection and analysis of data.
Teeden, William	Instructional Coach	Develop and manage trainings for teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Traci Durrance

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.*

7

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

134

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,380

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

17

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

15

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	663	654	632	528	2477	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	228	196	221	155	800	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146	177	139	83	545	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	255	205	201	79	740	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	0	0	0	174	
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	0	0	0	76	89	86	71	322

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	20	0	0	0	20	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/9/2022

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	644	642	546	475	2307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	226	169	137	725
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	133	67	41	375
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	138	185	136	100	559
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	138	9	21	318
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	115	85	51	347

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	66	79	68	37	250

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	31	0	0	1	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	9	14

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	644	642	546	475	2307
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193	226	169	137	725
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	133	67	41	375
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	138	185	136	100	559
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	138	9	21	318
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	115	85	51	347

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	66	79	68	37	250

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	31	0	0	1	32
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	9	14

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%				47%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	50%						53%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						39%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	57%	39%	38%				56%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	68%						64%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						66%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	45%	46%	40%				59%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	49%	48%				73%	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	58%	66%	-8%	67%	-9%
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	72%	73%	-1%	70%	2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	48%	63%	-15%	61%	-13%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	62%	57%	5%	57%	5%

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	20	42	40	34	46	33	19	34		97	35
ELL	13	38	31	37	65	46	20	53		97	46
BLK	32	46	31	37	51	19	29	43		99	39
HSP	36	49	32	54	66	50	38	64		97	53
MUL	50	28		58	50			55		100	42
WHT	47	53	40	66	76	56	59	77		98	70
FRL	35	47	35	54	67	47	41	62		97	52
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	20	32	24	21	34	38	33	42		95	26
ELL	13	34	32	22	32	37	19	34		98	41
BLK	24	42	33	26	32	36	32	36		92	22

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	35	44	39	35	36	42	42	62		99	52
MUL	48	52		39	29		47			90	
WHT	53	57	37	45	39	45	57	77		99	58
FRL	35	45	38	35	36	42	43	61		97	44
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	15	32	24	32	39	43	35	45		89	23
ELL	17	41	39	40	65	83	32	49		86	37
ASN	73	93								100	73
BLK	23	39	33	35	36		22	54		92	30
HSP	40	51	41	51	68	71	55	69		92	51
MUL	55	50		77	73		73			100	50
WHT	60	59	41	66	64	64	71	80		94	48
FRL	41	51	41	52	62	65	53	67		92	45

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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	617
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	46
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	43
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	54
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	55
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	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?

ELA and Biology achievement both decreased by one percentage point. Also, our ELA bottom quartile saw a decline of four percentage points. US History increased by one percentage point. Algebra 1 and Geo both saw significant increases. Our SWD students fell below the 41% overall federal index for a 3rd consecutive year. They were at 40% in 2022.

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

Biology and ELA demonstrate the greatest need for improvement, as they both dropped one percentage point in achievement. Bottom quartile ELA is the most significant drop at four percentage points.

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

Contributing factors include poor attendance, lack of student engagement, and work completion. New actions that will be taken are: placing students appropriately into Reading and English classes, consistent and meaningful PLC meetings, common planning time built into core content areas, the use of common assessments, identifying and reteaching content through bell work, small groups and after school tutorials.

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

Geo and Algebra 1 saw major improvements. Math achievement was up 20 percentage points. Learning gains up 31 points and bottom quartile up 5 points.

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

Contributing factors for this improvement: students are appropriately placed into math classes, consistent and meaningful PLC meetings, the use of common assessments, identifying and reteaching content through bell work, small groups and after school tutorials. We will continue the way of work in math since it has been proven to be extremely successful.

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

Consistent and meaningful PLC meetings in Bio, ELA and History. Implementing common assessment and a strong focus on standards and student academic ownership. This may also include small group instructions, tutorials and bootcamps.

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.

Teachers and leaders will have the opportunity to participate in professional development on student engagement, collaboration, and small group instruction. Lunch and learns as well as professional learning communities where data analysis, common assessments and next steps for instruction will be a focus.

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

Substitute teachers will be paid out of Title 1 to allow for a Professional Development Day during the fall after progress monitoring scores return. Common planning will be built into teachers' schedules. Also making PLCs a common practice weekly that sustains. Also, strategically placing students in classes and develop ways to retain highly effective teachers for sustainability.

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 Student Engagement**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

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

Increasing student engagement directly impacts overall learning, test scores and proficiency across all content areas. Focusing on improving student engagement will directly impact student success and overall school improvements in data and growth.

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

The overall goal will be to earn enough combined school grade points to earn an A.

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

Through Professional Learning Communities our teachers and staff will monitor assessment data, trends in the classroom and address areas of focus to continually improve student engagement daily.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Our teachers will use the tackle strategy, Jigsaw method, and classroom discussion to increase engagement and understanding literacy concepts. Students will also have opportunities to practice in print and on laptops/computers to increase cross content literacy skills.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**

The reading TACKLE Strategy allows students to preview, leverage prior knowledge and make predictions of any piece of text. This strategy increase understanding and ability to improve skills needed when reading more rigorous texts. The TACKLE Strategy also prepares students to participate in class discussions which in turn increase academic ownership and learning. Another evidence-based strategy we will use is the Jigsaw method, this helps members of a group or class share responsibility for learning. It also increases the use of critical thinking skills, listening, speaking and communication.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Professional Development for staff to increase effectiveness of Professional Learning communities and strengthening of academic ownership through the use of new strategies. PD will include specific strategies that will increase engagement with our SWD students in the ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

Demonstration classrooms, learning walks and coaching cycles with the TTD.

Person Responsible Vincent D'Acunto (vincent.d'acunto@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.

Every math and ELA teacher was given a new curriculum to implement this school year. Standards are the backbone of a curriculum. If they are spending most of their planning on implementing standards, then standards-based instruction would naturally be our focus as a whole group.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The overall goal will be to observe grade-level appropriate instruction in 100% of our state-assessed math, ELA, Bio and US History classes.

Monitoring:

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

Through Professional Learning Communities our teachers and staff will monitor assessment data, and address area of instruction to improve alignment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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

Teachers will meet frequently in PLC's to align their planning to the standards assessed. Common assessments will be generated, producing data that will indicate where students are not able to master the content. From that data, we can plan a school wide plan to emphasize key standards to selected groups of students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Because the curriculum are new to all staff, we have to start somewhere. Designing lessons that asses for specific standards will yield into Teachers to hone in on key topics that the students are underachieving in their education. Better understanding of standards lead to better assessment scores which will lead to increased self esteem.

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.

Professional Development for staff to increase effectiveness of Professional Learning communities and specifically focusing on aligned instruction.. PD will include specific strategies that will differentiate instruction with our SWD students in the ESSA subgroup.

Person Responsible

Susan Sullivan (susan.sullivan@hcps.net)

Create Professional Learning Communities and hold them accountable to regularly meet together and plan. Assign common planning time to state-assessed PLC groups.

Person Responsible

Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Gather observable data on what is observed in various classrooms relating to their specific standards. This data will be reflected in administrator's Talent Management System as well as feedback from each observation.

Person Responsible

Lana Smith (lana.smith@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

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.

Our school works to include all stakeholders in our school culture. We work diligently with our community members, parents, students and staff to build an environment that is open to communication and willing to make improvements for all involved parties. We have a number of events that promote academics, sports, extra curricular as well as opportunities for life beyond high school into the college and career level.

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

We have a Business Advisory Board that is made up of community members, business affiliates, and school staff that contributes to our Career Academy and all our school systems. These relationships are intended to work towards ensuring our students are prepared for life beyond high school.