Robinson High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 7/14/2022

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
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 (62%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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

Robinson High School

6311 S LOIS AVE, Tampa, FL 33616

[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	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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 will provide a positive, healthy, and safe environment while promoting high expectations and providing diverse cultural experiences and valuable educational opportunities for the Robinson High School family.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Robinson High School multicultural family is committed to preparing students to meet the challenges of the future by encouraging lifelong learning, international and intercultural awareness, work and professional skills, and "Pride Through Excellence".

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
Brown, David	Principal	
Bryan, Wendy	Instructional Coach	
Cribb, Daniel	Assistant Principal	
Gibbons, Lee	Teacher, K-12	Chair
Morman, Kailyn	Assistant Principal	
Pettit, Christopher	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/14/2022, David Brown

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.*
1

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
68

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,379

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
10

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	367	347	305	357	1376
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70	73	77	90	310
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	48	37	38	163
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	39
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	35
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	49	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	49	24	0	117
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	49	0	0	90

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	18	28	28	47	121

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
Tuesday 8/30/2022

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	366	422	329	349	1466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	98	90	25	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	31	23	4	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	70	40	0	170
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	56	34	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	97	50	36	318

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	87	32	32	2	153

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	366	422	329	349	1466
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	98	90	25	302
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	31	23	4	112
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	70	40	0	170
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	56	34	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	47	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135	97	50	36	318

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	87	32	32	2	153

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	65%	52%	51%				69%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	57%						65%	54%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						38%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	51%	39%	38%				46%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	31%						34%	48%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%						35%	45%	45%
Science Achievement	82%	46%	40%				72%	69%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	49%	48%				82%	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	70%	66%	4%	67%	3%

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	80%	73%	7%	70%	10%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	27%	63%	-36%	61%	-34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	53%	57%	-4%	57%	-4%

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	28	49	33	16	14		69	77		86	24
ELL	32	54	56	41	58		64	81		94	47
ASN	77	67		77			86	97		96	78
BLK	40	40	47	21	32	43	54	79		92	30
HSP	60	56	48	40	25		85	90		91	54
MUL	58	44	15	67	42		76	90		86	60
WHT	72	61	45	60	32	50	87	96		90	73
FRL	46	47	38	36	33	44	70	83		84	42
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	29	24	24	26	25	20	59		79	29
ELL	17	30	24	15	19	10	29			84	24

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
ASN	83	57		63	46		83	96		100	92
BLK	35	34	35	18	26	32	37	69		81	45
HSP	60	50	19	37	20	25	63	67		86	53
MUL	68	57		24	21		67	87		92	64
WHT	71	51	32	60	29	36	73	89		89	68
FRL	48	42	26	26	22	24	53	67		78	51

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	23	30	27	25	34	40	45	50		79	22
ELL	25	38	29	22	25	20	29	36		90	37
ASN	88	86		57			93	97		90	70
BLK	40	46	41	28	18	19	46	70		95	26
HSP	58	54	25	35	35	38	59	71		90	53
MUL	71	68	36	56	44		87	93		100	50
WHT	77	71	45	56	41	44	80	86		90	68
FRL	45	50	28	29	35	38	50	71		85	44

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	29
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	644
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
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	83
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	48
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	60
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	60
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	67
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	51
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?

FSA/EOC data indicate 65% of students are proficient in ELA, 51% in Math, 82% in Science, 92% in US History.

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

Data showed Learning Gains and Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% are the greatest areas in need of improvement.

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

Placing focus on comprehensive planning and rigorous instruction will allow us to accelerate and address these areas of need.

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

Biology and ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%.

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

We purposefully placed our students into a Science class based on previous science scores. We purposefully place students into the correct reading course based on their previous state scores

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

We will need to improve teacher planning and ensure teachers are creating lessons that relate directly to the State Standards

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.

Non-evaluative Walkthroughs with feedback forms directly related to look-for criteria, Action Plan review through ILT, Weekly Walkthroughs, PLC logs 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 opportunities will include FSA/EOC

Data Review and planning, student baseline data chats and action planning, scaffolding to the Standards. Teacher reflection statements to ILT will used for teacher goal-setting.

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

We will train teachers to break down Baseline Data results and how to hold student data chats in order to assist all students to excel.

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.**	Data collected from teacher observations for the 2021-2022 school year showed the highest level of "Progressing" ratings were in 3C - Engaging Students in Learning
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	At the end of the 2022-2023 school year, the teacher domain B2 - Engagement in Learning, will not be the lowest rating of the 8 areas being rated.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Teachers will receive training on the 4 Principles of Effective Instruction. Teachers will conduct non-evaluative classroom walk-thrus within their departments and will complete a Microsoft Form to answer questions about the lessons observed in regards to student engagement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Brown (david.brown@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The "4 Principles of Excellent Instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Students engaged in the learning will retain more information and will be exposed to more rigorous content which will lead to better learning as evident by better results on Standardized tests.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

Robinson High School's Mission is to provide a positive, healthy, and safe environment wile promoting high expectations and providing diverse cultural experiences and valuable educational opportunities for the RHS family. Ongoing collaborative planning and professional development for teachers in Creating Culturally Conscious Classrooms will strengthen a positive school culture and environment.

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

Administration, social services, success coach, school counselors, social worker, school psychologist will continue to work with students, teachers, parents/guardians, and volunteers to continue building cultural consciousness in classrooms and throughout the campus.. Staff members will continue be offered professional development in cultural consciousness and teen mental health.