

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Phoenix Academy Of Excellence North



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	11
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Phoenix Academy Of Excellence North

13301 NW 24TH AVE, Miami, FL 33167

www.phoenixaoe.com

Demographics

Principal: Latoya Tucker Robinson T

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2018

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)	Alternative Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: No Grade 2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
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	
* 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 Dade 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Phoenix Academy Of Excellence North

13301 NW 24TH AVE, Miami, FL 33167

www.phoenixaoe.com

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year
Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

Our Mission at Phoenix Academy of Excellence is to provide students with an innovative, non-traditional and traditional learning environment to motivate our learners to fulfill their potential, both academically and socially. We are committed to educating our students through individualized instruction that is tailored to meet each student's needs. The goal of Phoenix Academy is to MOTIVATE, EDUCATE, and PREPARE our students, but also CULTIVATE life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"To provide the groundwork for continued success for a lifetime of achievement and success..."
Phoenix Academy offers students, who are challenged by the traditional approach to learning, the opportunity to earn a state-recognized high school diploma. We recognize that the students we serve require a solid middle school education, job preparedness, and readiness for continuing education.

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
Tucker Robinson, Latoya	Principal	Principal is responsible for providing effective leadership and professional support to teachers and staff. The Principal also sets academic goals and ensure that students meet the learning objectives outlined by the district pacing guide/ Curriculum. Also, overseeing the schools' day to day operations , discipline issues, managing staff, hiring personnel, and ensuring that the School's Mission is evident in our daily routine.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/1/2018, Latoya Tucker Robinson T

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

2

Total number of students enrolled at the school

30

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

0

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

0

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 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	

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

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	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	

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		55%	50%					58%	54%
ELA Learning Gains								58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								52%	47%
Math Achievement		43%	36%					58%	58%
Math Learning Gains								56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								54%	51%
Science Achievement		54%	53%					52%	51%
Social Studies Achievement		64%	58%					74%	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	8%	58%	-50%	54%	-46%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	6%	56%	-50%	52%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	8%	58%	-50%	55%	-47%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	40%	-40%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%
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	6%	73%	-67%	71%	-65%
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					

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
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
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
BLK	5	41		5	17						
FRL	8	45		8	17						

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

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?

According to 2021 assessment data, Our school demonstrated 18 % Learning Gains in ELA. Math Learning Gains were 29%.

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

Based on the data delineated in Section (A), the following subgroups in grades 3-5 demonstrate a need for improvement in the areas listed below:

1. All subgroups ELA
2. All subgroups Math

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

Factors that contribute to the need for improvement in the areas listed above include the following:

1. Lack of foundational skills
2. Attendance concerns among struggling students
3. Lack of parental involvement
4. Need for explicit instruction
5. Behaviors that interrupt the learning process

The following actions need to be implemented to address the need for improvement:

1. Adherence to the MTSS process
2. Implementing intervention programs with fidelity
3. Engaging CSS services for parents and school stakeholders
4. Providing professional development for teachers on explicit instruction
5. Implementing a school-wide discipline plan

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

NA

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

Factors that contribute to the need for improvement in the areas listed above include the following:

1. Lack of foundational skills
2. Attendance concerns among struggling students
3. Lack of parental involvement
4. Need for explicit instruction
5. Behaviors that interrupt the learning process

The following actions need to be implemented to address the need for improvement:

1. Adherence to the MTSS process
2. Implementing intervention programs with fidelity
3. Engaging CSS services for parents and school stakeholders
4. Providing professional development for teachers on explicit instruction
5. Implementing a school-wide discipline plan

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

The following strategies will be implemented in order to improve learning:

1. Attendance Initiatives
2. Intervention/RTI

3. Data Chats
4. Progress monitoring

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 following professional development opportunities will be provided at our school to improve learning:

1. Explicit Instruction
2. Data analysis
3. Intervention
4. MTSS

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

Additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement include:

1. Extended learning opportunities offered throughout the year.
2. Math /competitions
3. Writing Clubs/competitions
4. Science workshops

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 Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our area of focus is ELA based on our findings that demonstrated that the percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide standardized ELAAs and i-Ready results. Therefore as a collective we must improve our ability to provide targeted intervention, extended learning opportunities, and differentiated instruction based on the levels of the students we serve. We will provide instructional practices necessary for all students to access grade-level content in order to make learning gains and move towards proficiency.

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

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

If we successfully target ELA, then the school will demonstrate an increase of a minimum of 3 percentage points as evident by the 2022 ELA State Assessments.

Monitoring:

*Conduct quarterly data chats, adjust groups based on current data in real time, and followup with weekly walkthroughs to ensure quality instruction is taking place.

*Administrators will review weekly lesson plans for indication of differentiation for all students.

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

NA

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we successfully target student engagement, then the school will demonstrate an increase of a minimum of 10 percentage points as evidenced by the 2022 ELA State Assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If we successfully target student attendance, then the school will demonstrate an increase of a minimum of 3 percentage points as evidenced by the 2021 ELA State Assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The Lead Teacher/Principal will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure student engagement is taking place. Principal will review weekly lesson plans for indication of meaningful goal oriented learning activities and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dirden, Antrell, adirden@dadeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Within our target of student engagement, our school will focus on the evidence-based strategy of: Goal Oriented Learning. Goal Oriented Learning will assist in accelerating the learning gains and proficiency of subgroups as it is a systematic approach of instruction to meet all student needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Goal Oriented Learning ensures the students have a clear understanding of the learning goal/target and a clear focus of what they will be able to accomplish or produce as a result of the lesson. Our data indicates that our students need to be more invested in learning goals, both short term and long term, and are more invested in their learning outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
September - October Teachers will provide students with incentives for participation and engagement in daily lessons in iReady, Read 180 with a passing rate of 60%.	Dirden, Antrell, adirden@dadeschools.net

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.

Our School prides itself with building a positive School Culture that consists of building Relationships, Physical and Emotional Safety and Support, and Engaging Career Management Courses for our students. Our school maintains a pattern of supportive interactions which foster positive staff student relationships. Leadership Team and School Counselor through Values Matter program create norms, values, and expectations that support social, emotional, and physical safety. Monthly core values are shared, examples provided, and students recognized by teacher or staff for exhibiting this value throughout the year. We celebrate the successes of students and staff by emphasizing accomplishments and collaboration. During monthly faculty meetings teachers share best practices and provide opportunities for others to view it in action. Additionally, students are recognized weekly through iReady, attendance, and their performance on student work.

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

The stakeholders involved in building positive school culture and environment are the Principal, Teacher Leaders, and Counselor. The Principal's role is to monitor and oversee all the school's initiatives and respond to concerns with student safety and the learning environment. The Teacher Leaders assist with providing necessary resources for teachers to maximize learning opportunities and ensure students are engaged with instruction.