Bayonet Point Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bayonet Point Middle School

11125 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://bpms.pasco.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Cindy Jack

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2021

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
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 (42%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%)
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 Pasco 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

Bayonet Point Middle School

11125 LITTLE RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

https://bpms.pasco.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served
(per MSID File)

Middle School
6-8

2021-22 Title I School

Yes

2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate
(as reported on Survey 3)

87%

Primary Service Type
(per MSID File)

K-12 General Education

Charter School

No

2018-19 Minority Rate
(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)

49%

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 Pasco 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.

Reaching Every Student every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empowering tomorrow's problem solvers to change the world.

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
Babiarz, Mark	Teacher, K-12	6th grade math teacher.
Mulvey, Laura	Instructional Coach	Coaches all ELA and SS teachers.
Cline, Lori	Teacher, K-12	Teaches 6th grade reading
Jack, Cindy	Assistant Principal	6th grade and A-M AP for 7th grade.
Wild, Kathy	Assistant Principal	8th grade and N-Z 7th grade AP.
Peterson, Joshua	Teacher, K-12	Resource teacher for ELA and Math students to provide interventions and supports.
McPherson, Kelly	Principal	Principal of Bayonet Point Middle School
Schrader, Charity	Teacher, K-12	Civics Teacher
Thompson, Cynthia	Dropout Prevention Coordinator	Grad Enhancement and credit recovery.
Wiest, Bret	Dropout Prevention Coordinator	Grad Enhancement and credit recovery.
Sanger-Miller, Susan	Teacher, ESE	6th grade ESE support Teacher.
Babiarz, Martha	Instructional Coach	LDC for all Math and Science Teachers.
Brown, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	8th grade Math teacher.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 8/3/2021, Cindy Jack

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.*
21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Total number of students enrolled at the school
728

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

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	229	223	252	0	0	0	0	704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	17	17	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	57	63	0	0	0	0	185
Course failure in ELA	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		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	100	95	0	0	0	0	290
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	90	68	0	0	0	0	276
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	100	95	0	0	0	0	290
Course Failure in ELA and Math combined	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	42	79	0	0	0	0	160

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	0	0	0	0	

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

Monday 7/11/2022

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	243	268	254	0	0	0	0	765
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	87	81	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	46	41	0	0	0	0	133
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	109	120	0	0	0	0	283
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	80	0	0	0	0	234

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	71	101	99	0	0	0	0	271

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	17	0	0	0	0	17
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	243	268	254	0	0	0	0	765
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	87	81	0	0	0	0	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	46	41	0	0	0	0	133
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	109	120	0	0	0	0	283
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	83	80	0	0	0	0	234

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	71	101	99	0	0	0	0	271

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	17	0	0	0	0	17
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	29%	46%	50%				43%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	35%						49%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%						47%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	32%	34%	36%				49%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	45%						52%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						42%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	54%	53%				41%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	59%	58%				52%	68%	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	42%	56%	-14%	54%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	42%	51%	-9%	52%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2022					
	2019	41%	58%	-17%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2022					
	2019	42%	59%	-17%	55%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	34%	42%	-8%	54%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
08	2022					
	2019	51%	68%	-17%	46%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				

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	38%	54%	-16%	48%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	51%	70%	-19%	71%	-20%

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	95%	60%	35%	61%	34%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%

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	38	37	19	37	43	24	34	40		
ELL	10	31	33	10	33	44		40			
BLK	24	37	25	27	56	65	29	50			
HSP	27	38	39	22	44	53	32	64	50		
MUL	32	46		21	39	50		60			
WHT	31	33	25	40	44	49	41	57	54		
FRL	28	33	25	31	42	51	35	55	54		
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	26	34	22	23	36	34	23	49			
ELL	15	38	28	17	32	44	10	47			
BLK	31	31	28	25	41	58	22	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
HSP	35	44	30	32	35	36	28	62	36		
MUL	47	48		45	36		80	82			
WHT	37	35	22	43	40	41	40	71	41		
FRL	34	36	26	37	37	40	33	65	36		

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	24	42	40	25	42	33	26	21	20		
ELL	18	34	32	14	35	38	9	42			
ASN	85	55		69	83						
BLK	25	29	25	27	40	41	21	31			
HSP	31	45	45	31	42	38	18	51	44		
MUL	43	48		52	43						
WHT	48	52	50	57	56	43	48	55	48		
FRL	38	46	45	44	49	39	32	50	48		

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	32
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	96%

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	26
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	41
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	41
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	42
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

While we saw learning gains in our subgroups, our overall achievement level was low in math and ELA. Social Studies showed promising subgroup achievement. Our 7th graders have to lowest gains while our 8th grades had our biggest gains in ELA.

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

Our greatest need for improvement is in ELA gains.

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

We have moved back to teams and intensive reading as a stand alone class and not a push in class. We have started a reading initiative that students are reading and writing across curriculum.

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

Our social students achievement in our subgroups.

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

We have two very strong teachers that we able to connect their standards to reading levels that helped students better understand what was being asked.

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

We need strong ties to our standards, strong and consistent structures, improved attendance, and cross curricular activities.

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.

Our teachers have been trained over the summer on the 5Es, we will continue that as well as how to infused reading and writing across curriculum.

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

We are adding a resource teacher that will be able to provide small group reteaching, we have created self-contained intensive reading classes, and we have restructured our PLC and Professional development.

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 English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	15% of our English language learners scored at least an achievement level 3 in ELA and only 28% of our lowest 25% made learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We plan to see an increase of 5% in lowest 25% learning gains and an increase of 4% in achievement.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will continue with our ELL support plus we have added intensive reading as a stand alone class and we have a resource teacher that can work with small groups of students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Wild (khorten@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Small group support partnered with lexia in intensive reading with our level 1 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	More intense intervention to help close the learning gap.

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.

1. Identify level 1 and 2 ELL students
2. Put level 1 students in intensive reading with Lexia
3. Make sure ELL resource IA reviews data and placement
4. Have resource teacher review data and create small groups
5. Monitor progress through assessments and Lexia (for level 1)

Person Responsible   Kathy Wild (khorten@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. 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.**	26% of our students with disabilities scored an achievement level 3 or higher and only 22% of our lowest 25% made learning gains.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	We plan to see an increase of 8% in lowest 25% learning gains and an increase of 4% in achievement.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We have added intensive reading as a stand alone class and we have a resource teacher that can work with small groups of students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Wild (khorten@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Small group support partnered with lexia in intensive reading with our level 1 students. Level 2 students will receive support through their core classes and our resource teacher will pull small groups.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	More intensive small group focus to close the gap.

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.

1. Identify level 1 and 2 students
2. Put level 1 students in intensive reading with Lexia
4. Have resource teacher review data and create small groups
5. Monitor progress through assessments and Lexia (for level 1)

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

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.

We have clear expectations for our students. We work to build relationships and center all of our STEM education around literacy. With a strong focus we have a positive culture, as everyone has the same goal and vision.

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

SAC - feedback, areas of opportunity and student celebrations
Parent group - student and teacher recognition, volunteers, and community events.
Leadership - keep our vision and mission the focus, lead the school in that direction.
Teams - teacher groups that have the same students that can work as one unit to move our students forward.