Walter C. Young Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Walter C. Young Middle School

901 NW 129TH AVE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33028

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Mark Henderson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	78%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (60%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (64%)
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

Walter C. Young Middle School

901 NW 129TH AVE, Pembroke Pines, FL 33028

[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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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.

Walter C. Young Middle School is a community of learners where all stakeholders (staff, parents and community) strive to ensure that all students exit performing their highest potential in academic and behavioral achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's 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
Henderson, Mark	Principal	
Reeves, Ben	Assistant Principal	
Doval, Madelyn	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Mark Henderson

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.*
16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
49

Total number of students enrolled at the school
871

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

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	347	345	361	0	0	0	0	1053
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	27	18	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	43	32	0	0	0	0	91
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	33	14	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	39	46	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	57	0	0	0	0	130
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	41	54	0	0	0	0	145

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	56	72	78	0	0	0	0	206

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	8	27	53	0	0	0	0	88
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6

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	320	323	333	0	0	0	0	976
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	13	54	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	18	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	46	69	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	90	81	0	0	0	0	252
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	90	81	0	0	0	0	252

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	6	15	81	0	0	0	0	102

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	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	6

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	320	323	333	0	0	0	0	976
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	13	54	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	18	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	46	69	0	0	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	90	81	0	0	0	0	252
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	90	81	0	0	0	0	252

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	6	15	81	0	0	0	0	102

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	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	6

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	58%	54%	50%				66%	57%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	54%	48%				57%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	44%	38%				47%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	58%	52%	54%				65%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	63%	58%				57%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	58%	55%				46%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	49%	49%				65%	49%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	71%	71%				77%	71%	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	65%	57%	8%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	57%	55%	2%	52%	5%
Cohort Comparison	-65%					
08	2022					
	2019	71%	59%	12%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison	-57%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	54%	58%	-4%	55%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	62%	53%	9%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
08	2022					
	2019	57%	45%	12%	46%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

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	59%	43%	16%	48%	11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	67%	33%	67%	33%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	74%	71%	3%	71%	3%
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	96%	61%	35%	61%	35%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	56%	44%	57%	43%

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	23	36	33	28	46	40	24	44			
ELL	42	52	42	47	64	49	38	72	47		
ASN	72	57		79	85		57	86	80		
BLK	50	53	45	48	63	49	46	67	67		
HSP	58	51	41	61	72	61	52	81	75		
MUL	68	87		73	88						
WHT	72	65	45	65	68	69	62	95	86		
FRL	52	51	37	49	66	54	41	71	65		
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	31	37	30	24	32	31	27	35	50		
ELL	59	57	42	42	33	29	42	64	48		
ASN	79	72	58	63	51	45	79	67	75		
BLK	52	45	30	42	28	21	44	65	54		
HSP	65	57	41	50	34	28	56	63	55		
MUL	76	58		58	18						
WHT	70	55	22	57	41	31	66	74	61		
FRL	55	49	32	41	30	27	45	61	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	28	44	40	28	39	36	28	48	31		
ELL	46	61	56	51	59	51	48	57	67		
ASN	77	80		80	78			87	88		
BLK	60	51	44	59	49	38	61	72	62		
HSP	67	59	51	65	57	50	66	77	66		
MUL	77	55		76	71		58				
WHT	74	57	48	74	62	59	63	91	62		
FRL	59	55	47	56	52	46	57	72	60		

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	61
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	611
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	52
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	74
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	54
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	62
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	79
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	70
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	54
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?

For 2022, gains were seen in 6 of the 8 reporting categories. Math was the strongest performer, with proficiency increasing by 9 points, learning gains increasing by 36, and learning gains for the lowest quartile increasing 30 points. ELA proficiency decreased by 5 percentage points and learning gains were stagnant. However, ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile rose 7 points. Science was the only other area to see a decrease in proficiency from 55% to 52%. Social studies showed substantial improvement, with proficiency rising 12 points.

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

ELA as a whole is a point of concern. Data shows a decrease in proficiency and no improvement in learning gains for regular students. There was a modest increase in learning gains for the lowest quartile. This is applicable to all subgroups, and is even more stark when compared to the state assessments for other curriculum areas.

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

Clearly, the unusual nature of the previous 2 school years due to COVID had a negative impact on student achievement. This was somewhat expected because reading comprehension and other components of the ELA FSA are the most abstract with regards to the skills needed to be successful. With face to face instruction being limited the previous two years, many students lost many of the ELA skills they had learned. Also, reading instruction is poorly suited to virtual learning and many students were in that environment for an extended period of time. A back to basics approach is needed to meet students where they currently are, address learning gaps, and scaffold them up to the appropriate level. More creative ELO opportunities are also needed, as funding is not as robust as it was last year.

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

Math overall was a strong performer, showing significant gains in all three reported categories. Learning Gains were impressive, with a 36 point increase for regular students, and 30 point increase in learning gains for the lowest quartile.

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

The availability of additional math support via ESSER position played a role in realizing these gains. There some new math teachers added to the staff last year that were very effective and provided quality instruction. In addition, math is the curriculum that works fairly well in a virtual environment, as there are very few abstract concepts. Math also had a very effective incentive plan for students based on iReady progress. This definitely raised motivation for studentsA to put forth their best effort.

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

Considering the learning gaps exhibited by many students as a result of the previous 2 years, more attention will be paid to foundational knowledge. Many students struggle with the more advanced concepts because their foundational knowledge is lacking. There will also be a greater focus on the SEL component of learning. There is a big issue with student apathy and lack of interest in academics.

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.

Student engagement is a major priority this year. Engagement strategies was a one of our main PD offerings for pre-planning week, and it will continue to be as the year progresses. PLCs are also putting and emphasis on engagement in addition to data analysis. We are also in year 2 of implementing literacy though the content areas and there will be multiple PD offerings in this regard.

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

Starting quarter 2, we will begin our Extended Learning Opportunities to provide additional support in all curriculum areas. We will also increase our incentive offerings to further motivate students to raise their owen achievement levels.

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 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.**	Data shows SWD students showed a decrease in all three areas of the ELA FSA for 2022. SWD was also the lowest performing subgroup in nearly everyone of the reporting categories, regardless of curriculum area.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	By June 2023, 27% of Students with disabilities will be proficient on the FAST ELA assessment.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The desired outcome will be determined by the formal data from the FAST Progress Monitoring 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Student Centered Lessons, particularly focusing on engagement, will be the foundation of our instructional plan. Level of engagement will be a key component of lesson planning, along with scope and sequence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Student apathy is at an all time high. Many students that are perfectly capable of doing grade level work, just are not doing it and don't seem to care one way or another. Analysis of student progress reports and anecdotal data confirms this.

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.

Introduce Student Engagement as school focus during pre-planning. - All APs
Provide PD on student engagement as part of the pre-planning agenda. - All APs
Reward teachers with appropriate data marks in student engagement. - All APs

Person Responsible	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)

Provide PD on student engagement as part of the pre-planning agenda. -
Reward teachers with appropriate data marks in student engagement.

Person Responsible	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)

Reward teachers with appropriate data marks in student engagement. -

Person Responsible	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELA as a whole is a point of concern. Data shows a decrease in proficiency and no improvement in learning gains for regular students. There was a modest increase in learning gains for the lowest quartile. This is applicable to all subgroups, and is even more stark when compared to the state assessments for other curriculum areas.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	By June 2023, 62% or more of students in grades 6 - 8 will be proficient on the FAST ELA assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress will be monitored by analyzing CFA data as will as FAST PM data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Literacy Through the Content Area is on of the foundations of our Literacy Plan schoolwide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The idea is that every teacher plays a role in promoting and encouraging literacy, not just the ELA and Reading teachers. The more students are exposed to some key strategies like Cornell Notes and Close Reads, the more capable they become.

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.	
Close Read strategy will be a dedicated PD during pre-planning week.	
Person Responsible	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)
Classroom Walkthroughs by APs will be used to monitor implementation.	
Person Responsible	Mark Henderson (mark.henderson@browardschools.com)
Additional PDs in Vocabulary and Cornell notes, which was started last year, will be rolled out throughout the year.	
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.

Walter C. Young (WCY) Middle focuses on empowering students to succeed in a changing world, which will be accomplished by creating a community of learners where all students exit performing at their highest potential in academic and character achievement. Our program embodies students completing eighth grade will become independent thinkers and responsible citizens with skills and knowledge to make informed decisions ensuring future success. Our educators are data informed, and they use this data to drive our curriculum. We are preparing the high school ready and college bound students. In addition, Walter C Young Middle School offers a plethora of enrichment academic and elective courses. These courses are based on the current academic standard, as well as guides, which are created to prepare students for real-life skills. Beyond the enrichment classes' students can take part in organizations, such as Student Government, Orchestra (string instruments), Band (wind instruments), Physical Education, Chess Club, Florida Future Educators, First Priority, Finance Club, Jazz Band, Environmental Club, National Junior Honor Society, Science Club, and Yearbook Club. As for sports, we include boys' and girls' teams for Soccer, Volleyball, Basketball, Flag Football, Cheerleading, and Track. Overall, WCY depicts a combination of rigor, remediation, and enrichment to help prepare all students to become productive citizens and outstanding members of their school and community, as well as prepare them for their high school years. Our student incentive initiatives are meant to increase to amount of dedication and effort amongst all students. They provide crucial positivity that spreads around the campus.

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

Our staff is instrumental in spreading positivity throughout the campus. With the revamped Sunshine Committee, great strides have been made to increase morale amongst staff, which translates into a more positive learning environment for our students.

Our Sunshine Committee has vastly increased our community participation and awareness, and has allowed Walter C. Young to be seen in a more positive light throughout the community.