

Pasco County Schools

Centennial Middle 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Rick Saylor R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2022

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)	74%
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 (48%) 2017-18: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI

* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Centennial Middle School

38505 CENTENNIAL RD, Dade City, FL 33525

<https://cenms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">74%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">48%</p>

School Grades History

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

Centennial Middle School creates a STEM culture of excellence; a safe and friendly school with a challenging curriculum where all students receive a world-class education.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence in STEM Education for ALL Students.

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
Carroll, Scotty	Instructional Coach	
Jacobs, John	Teacher, K-12	
Larson, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Morris, Sharon	Assistant Principal	
Pearce, Karen	Teacher, ESE	
Rulison, Kim	Dropout Prevention Coordinator	
Wolff, Jeff	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/27/2022, Rick Saylor R

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.*

25

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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

13

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	195	207	200	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	60	61	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	42	27	0	0	0	0	103
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	30	0	0	0	0	120
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	88	45	0	0	0	0	177
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	78	88	0	0	0	0	258
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	66	79	0	0	0	0	227
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	78	88	0	0	0	0	258

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	37	59	42	0	0	0	0	138

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	188	212	198	0	0	0	0	598
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	35	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	34	37	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	91	63	0	0	0	0	203
Level I on 2019 Statewide FSA ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	69	62	0	0	0	0	198
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	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	54	72	58	0	0	0	0	184

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	188	212	198	0	0	0	0	598
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	41	35	0	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	34	37	0	0	0	0	110
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	49	91	63	0	0	0	0	203
Level I on 2019 Statewide FSA ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	69	62	0	0	0	0	198
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	54	72	58	0	0	0	0	184

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	36%	46%	50%				42%	52%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	38%						52%	55%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	32%						41%	47%	47%
Math Achievement	39%	34%	36%				46%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	50%						50%	61%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						43%	52%	51%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	31%	54%	53%				44%	52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	59%	58%				56%	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	45%	56%	-11%	54%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	35%	51%	-16%	52%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
08	2022					
	2019	49%	58%	-9%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	48%	59%	-11%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	19%	42%	-23%	54%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2022					
	2019	54%	68%	-14%	46%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

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	44%	54%	-10%	48%	-4%
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	55%	70%	-15%	71%	-16%
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	100%	60%	40%	61%	39%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	10	33	34	14	35	38	12	22			
ELL	19	26	18	16	47	36	4	31			
BLK	23	32	25	28	41	45	18	47			
HSP	32	38	27	31	48	39	27	43	48		
MUL	33	31		29	33						
WHT	40	40	37	46	53	57	36	58	62		
FRL	30	38	35	34	48	46	26	46	50		
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	11	26	20	10	30	33	10	27			

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
ELL	12	20	11	19	25	22		41			
BLK	17	38	39	15	43	44	17				
HSP	34	35	16	39	33	30	39	49	27		
MUL	55	48		43	55		90				
WHT	48	47	39	43	42	46	49	66	37		
FRL	33	37	28	33	36	40	36	49	28		

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	13	39	40	19	38	35	19	27			
ELL	8	38	40	19	35	37		24			
BLK	20	36	38	24	33	38		24			
HSP	37	50	41	39	47	44	42	49	56		
MUL	48	58		52	46						
WHT	48	55	41	53	55	44	49	66	56		
FRL	35	47	39	39	45	41	37	49	53		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	442
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	32
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	32
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	48
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?

We saw decreases in attendance, course performance, and assessment scores.

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

All areas as we are still working to overcome learning regression due to the COVID-19 situation the past few years.

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

All lesson plans aligned to the 5 E's + model

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

Learning Gains in Math

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

Intervention period focus

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

5 E's + learning plans have enrichment 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.

5 E's + Learning Plan training over the summer
 Professional Development throughout the school year (using Early Release Days)
 District Support and Coaching

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

District support for teachers
Enhanced new teacher support program

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 B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Training and implementation with fidelity of standards-based 5 E's + Learning Plans
---	---

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Improve the number of students scoring on the FAST assessment during the year.
--	--

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Monitoring student scores on each of the FAST assessments along with PLC Common Formative Assessments
--	---

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)
---	---------------------------------------

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	5 E's + Learning Plans
---	------------------------

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Higher level thinking and active students engagement
--	--

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

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students and staff will increase in their engagement levels through a variety of collaborative structures.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Gallup scores Staff Engagement: 4.25, Student Engagement: 4.25, Student Hope: 4.50 Staff Gallup Questions through Friday Feedback: Average Rating of scores from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) being a 3.5 during the school year. Questions will be rotated throughout Friday Feedback forms.

Monitoring:

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

Through Friday Feedback forms, meetings with staff, and Student Leadership groups

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Gallup Engagement Survey

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Measures the engagement of both students and staff

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

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Focus on fidelity of implementation of 5 E's + Learning Plans for all students

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

Decrease of 10% in the number of ESSA Subgroups not meeting proficiency on the State Assessment System.

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

Monthly SIT Meetings by Grade Level
 Monthly SLT meetings
 Weekly SIT Team meeting

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
 Rick Saylor (rsaylor@pasco.k12.fl.us)

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

5 E's + Learning Plans

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Increased engagement and achievement

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

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.

- Implementing feedback from SLT and Student Leadership Team
- Weekly Staff Feedback Forms (with follow-up)
- Additional Face-to-Face Teacher meetings
 - Further implementation of PBIS rewards for students and staff
 - Increased On-Track and PBIS activities for students

- Continue to stay focused on PLC cycle with Content PLCs
- Increase in hands-in learning opportunities for students
- Pineappling for teachers to improve in their practice and collaboration

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

All stakeholders are engaged in this process