

Broward County Public Schools

J. P. Taravella 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

J. P. Taravella High School

10600 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Marietta De Armas

Start Date for this Principal: 11/18/2018

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)	69%
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: C (53%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Broward 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

J. P. Taravella High School

10600 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[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	69%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

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 Broward 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.

Building relationships to make lasting impressions while motivating, educating, and graduating our students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To prepare students to be college and career ready.

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
De Armas, Marietta	Principal	Instructional Leadership, organizational Leadership, professional and ethical leadership.
Crossman, Christopher	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership, organizational Leadership, professional and ethical leadership.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 11/18/2018, Marietta De Armas

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.*

4

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

119

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,589

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

20

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	0	736	719	690	658	2803
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236	299	300	265	1100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	79	47	33	267
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	159	87	30	423
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	140	150	118	576
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	201	153	130	33	517
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	309	165	97	4	575
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	39	24	5	121

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	285	226	203	116	830

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	30	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	3	3	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/1/2022

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	0	705	710	691	733	2839
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	113	113	115	467
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	9	1	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338	233	179	101	851
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191	146	132	106	575
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	113	132	120	530
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	106	75	161	510
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	0	292	210	179	174	855

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	11	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	10	24

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	0	705	710	691	733	2839
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	113	113	115	467
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	9	1	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	338	233	179	101	851
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	191	146	132	106	575
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165	113	132	120	530
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168	106	75	161	510
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	0	0	0	292	210	179	174	855

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	11	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	5	10	24

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	45%	52%	51%				47%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						44%	52%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						37%	45%	42%
Math Achievement	27%	41%	38%				43%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	43%						42%	44%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						36%	43%	45%
Science Achievement	58%	35%	40%				66%	66%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	51%	48%				76%	71%	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	65%	67%	-2%	67%	-2%
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	74%	67%	7%	70%	4%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	61%	-22%	61%	-22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	46%	56%	-10%	57%	-11%

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	25	46	38	15	36	46	31	32		91	18
ELL	25	49	55	27	45	55	57	43		82	47
ASN	38	35		38	40		64	86		100	56
BLK	42	52	43	20	42	50	50	67		94	33
HSP	45	54	51	28	42	52	58	65		90	47
MUL	55	62		24	25		58	71		100	46
WHT	56	57	41	42	52	56	74	75		94	55
FRL	41	51	42	21	39	48	53	66		93	41
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	13	29	35	13	20	21	25	34		95	24
ELL	20	43	49	19	22	28	26	28		88	59

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	60	58		29	26		59	86		97	74
BLK	39	40	38	13	18	23	51	48		96	42
HSP	44	40	34	20	18	23	57	57		91	53
MUL	43	27		21	13		60	73		100	69
WHT	56	46	48	29	18	21	59	68		96	66
FRL	41	39	37	15	17	25	51	47		94	46

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	18	33	33	24	35	30	42	46		87	25
ELL	31	44	40	37	50	49	56	56		69	48
ASN	54	49		55	48		75	91		92	83
BLK	38	43	38	35	35	31	54	70		91	38
HSP	48	42	32	42	47	41	67	72		89	55
MUL	61	54	43	48	44		75	86		96	36
WHT	57	46	38	56	45	32	78	83		94	56
FRL	40	42	36	39	43	39	60	72		90	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	53
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	584
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	57
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	49
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	60
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	50
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?

There were no distinct trend among grade level. However the White subgroup performed significantly better overall than the other subgroups. The Hispanic group performed better on the ELA than the Black group. While the black group performed better than the hispanic group in Mathematics. Overall the students performed better in Science and Social Studies than they do in ELA and Mathematics.

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

Mathematics showed the greatest need for 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?

The period of the Covid pandemic presented an unfortunate lack of engagement and school closure. This resulted in a significant learning gaps especial with the level of proficiency in mathematics. JPT has carefully selected the instructional staff, double block the students for Algebra 1 and provide tutoring for additional support.

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

The learning gains for the lowest 25% in mathematics showed the most significant improvement.

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

The students were double block and received continuous remediation and academic intervention through intensive tutoring.

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

The implementation of a school wide literacy plan and continuous intensive tutoring intervention should help to accelerate learning.

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.

The Literacy coach conducts professional training on common assessments, data analysis, and cross-curricular support.

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

The MTSS plan, guidance plan, careful scheduling and the School wide literacy plan will be implemented for sustainability of improvement in the upcoming school years.

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 Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Instructional Practice specifically related to Mathematics Achievement. Mathematics achievement was the lowest indicator at 27%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. By June 2023, mathematics achievement proficiency will increase by 5% per the statewide end of year assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. The teacher will conduct common summative assessment with the geometry and Algebra 1 groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marietta De Armas (mary.dearmas@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Systematic and Explicit instruction
Authentic PLC
Common Summative assessment and Data Analysis

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Systematic and Explicit instruction developed by the PLC maintains consistency and alignment with mathematics standards. Common Summative Assessment and Data Analysis will be used to drive instruction, enrichment and remediation.

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. Algebra 1 blocked- students have class on each day
2. Establishment of collaborative PLC time for Algebra 1 and Geometry Teachers
3. Collaboration with the literacy coach to implement strategies designed to increase vocabulary acquisition and comprehension skills.
4. Quarterly Assessments (Topic Readiness (Pre) and 3 CFAs per quarter (Post))
5. Full embrace of Savaas/Envision assessment aligned to standards & text for reliability
6. Students in Grade 10 that earned a level 1 or level 2 previously on Algebra 1 EOC will receive Algebra Reviews prior to re-testing

Person Responsible

Christopher Crossman
(christopher.crossman@browardschools.com)

#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.

Instructional Practice specifically related to SWD in Social Studies Achievement showed a deficit of 2% in the US History EOC

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2023, US History achievement proficiency will increase by 2% per the statewide end of year assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The teacher and support facilitator will collaboratively work on ensuring that students are assessed regularly for progress. Remediation and Enrichment provided to further extend the learning process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christopher Crossman
(christopher.crossman@browardschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Systematic and Explicit Instruction
Authentic PLC
Common Summative assessments and Data Analysis

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Systematic and Explicit instruction developed by the PLC maintains consistency and alignment with US History Standards. Common Summative Assessment and Data Analysis will be used to drive instruction, enrichment and remediation.

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.

- Emphasis on ESE student accommodations documented and noted for ALL classroom observations
- Refresher workshops were provided during planning week
- Emphasis on Literacy Initiatives and noted in all scheduled classroom observations
- School-wide Initiatives – Board Configuration, Pinnacle Grading/Assgnmts, PLC, etc
- Targeted Remediation and Progress Monitoring (CFAs & BSA)
- Reminders Ask Bria (i.e. extended absences)
- Tutoring Opportunities Before/After/During School
- Edmentum individualized assignments based on remediation needs
- Emphasis on proper placement during student scheduling
- Teacher selection during master scheduling
- Working with ESE Dept/Support Facilitators/Learning Strategies classes as per individual IEPs

Person Responsible

Christopher Crossman
(christopher.crossman@browardschools.com)

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.

JPT conducts SAC/PTSO meetings once every month. During these monthly SAC meetings stakeholders are provided information about each departments performance. The principal also informs the stakeholders of the social, emotional and educational status/progress of the staff and students. The committee also address concerns that the stakeholders may present. JPT also utilize several social media platform and website to encourage school spirit and solict support for the the public at large.

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

The students are the primary focus of the school. Every student is encourage to engage in sports, clubs, and regular social activities/gathering that promotes positive school culture. The instructional Staff is also encourage to engage in sports clubs, and regualr social gathering as role models to promote posutive school culture and environment. JPT regularly invites school board members district staff parenta and other stakeholders to participate in school socail activities to encorage a positive school culture and environment.