

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Martinez Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Martinez Middle School

5601 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty, staff, and community of Martinez Middle School will provide a safe and nurturing environment that encourages students to reach their maximum potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bob Martinez Middle School will foster an environment where all students thrive academically, socially, and emotionally through the collective efficacy of community stakeholders, school personnel, and students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, Toby	Principal	
Chahal, Skyler	Other	
Costanzo, Layla	Other	
Choate, Lonnie	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Our School Advisory Council and our site-based leadership team (Administration, Guidance, Subject Area Leaders, and Grade Level Team Leaders) used schoolwide data to create our School Improvement Plan.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be monitored through data analysis at monthly SAC meetings, Leadership Team Meetings, and PSLT meetings. We will look at school data as a whole in addition to specifically looking at students with the greatest achievement gap.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	55	56	139	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	18	36	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	38	0	77	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	22	0	41	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	23	53

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	29	44	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	36	53	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	43	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	29	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	29	44	108	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	36	53	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	25	43	91	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	29	29	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	23	53

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	74	49	49	76	50	50	75		
ELA Learning Gains				61			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			46		
Math Achievement*	87	57	56	83	36	36	77		
Math Learning Gains				78			62		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			46		
Science Achievement*	69	44	49	72	52	53	66		
Social Studies Achievement*	89	66	68	89	58	58	84		
Middle School Acceleration	92	84	73	95	51	49	89		
Graduation Rate					46	49			
College and Career Acceleration					74	70			
ELP Progress	46	39	40	68	86	76	79		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	739
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	65			
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK	78			
HSP	72			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	65			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	42			
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	63			
HSP	66			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	63			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	74			87			69	89	92			46
SWD	30			52			26	55	63		5	
ELL	50			76			56	76	83		6	48
AMI												
ASN	87			98			81	95	97		5	
BLK	66			74			59	92	100		5	
HSP	64			79			60	83	87		6	57
MUL	81			87			71	95	89		5	
PAC												
WHT	75			89			72	89	92		5	
FRL	60			77			56	79	87		6	31

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	76	61	50	83	78	67	72	89	95			68
SWD	24	32	27	38	62	60	19	71				
ELL	46	49	43	63	70	59	38	77	92			68
AMI												
ASN	87	74	65	92	91	76	71	92	95			

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	60	50	46	67	68	69	50	93				
HSP	63	54	40	72	72	62	57	82	96			64
MUL	82	70		89	80		90	90	93			
PAC												
WHT	80	61	55	86	78	70	77	91	96			
FRL	57	49	43	66	67	59	56	82	90			

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	75	61	46	77	62	46	66	84	89			79
SWD	28	43	39	31	38	29	22	42				
ELL	51	58	45	54	48	47	47	62	86			79
AMI												
ASN	86	78	50	86	70	60	87	90	100			
BLK	68	58	43	65	51	27	54	57	92			
HSP	64	54	44	62	52	40	53	73	79			70
MUL	82	60		78	69	40	67	89	89			
PAC												
WHT	77	61	50	82	65	51	68	89	90			
FRL	64	53	48	60	50	38	48	73	75			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	71%	47%	24%	47%	24%
08	2023 - Spring	64%	44%	20%	47%	17%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	77%	47%	30%	47%	30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	87%	53%	34%	54%	33%
07	2023 - Spring	45%	36%	9%	48%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	89%	57%	32%	55%	34%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	68%	41%	27%	44%	24%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	55%	43%	50%	48%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	49%	51%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	87%	64%	23%	66%	21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science Achievement decreased from 72% to 68%. Level 1 and Level 2 ELA students struggle with reading, vocabulary, and learning gaps from the pandemic.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

ELA Achievement decreased from 76% to 71%. The state assessment did not include same components as previous years assessment.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our school is above the state average in all components..

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Schoolwide Acceleration increased from 95% to 99% because more students were enrolled in high school courses and passed high school and/or industry certification exams.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

ELA and math bottom quartile students

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Science Achievement, ELA Achievement, Social Studies Achievement

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student achievement will increase when high quality standards-aligned instruction is delivered using school-wide implementation of WICOR strategies in daily lessons.

Measurable Outcome:

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

To increase student achievement, teachers will use grade level appropriate lessons while reaching individual student needs through differentiation in whole group and teacher led small group instruction. 10% increase in ELA, Math, and Science from PM 1 to PM 3.

Monitoring:

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

The instructional leadership team will meet bi-monthly to analyze the following data: common assessments, district and state assessments, progress monitoring assessments, and informal walkthrough evidence.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Skyler Chahal (skyler.chahal@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

SWAG- Weekly tutoring at lunch to provide reteaching and remediation, morning tutoring sessions, ELP

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will master grade level standards with personalized and small group instruction and remediation.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Monitor subject area PLC meetings to ensure that department meetings are focused on reading strategies

Person Responsible: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: year round

ELA/Reading PLC meetings focused on common assessments, common planning, and data analysis

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Tracie Holman

Schoolwide Professional Development focused on reading strategies

Person Responsible: Skyler Chahal (skyler.chahal@hcps.net)

By When: monthly

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Provide excellence in education, relationships, and culture through structure and contribution from staff and students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teacher Insight Survey data and Student Panorama Survey data will increase by 10% for the 2023-2024 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Panorama survey data (fall and spring administration), informal walkthrough data, bi-weekly PSLT and ILT meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

positive referrals, club days, student of the month, lessons implemented to develop a positive classroom culture

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementation of the above strategies will increase students' sense of belonging and positive interactions with peers.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 3 - Promising Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

increase use of "mustang moment" tickets, spending time each month to develop a positive classroom culture, teachers and administration making positive phone calls/emails home.

Person Responsible: Layla Costanzo (layla.costanzo@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

By When: first month of school

club days, campus beautification days, "student of the month," positive messages posted around the school

Person Responsible: Toby Johnson (toby.johnson@hcps.net)

By When: By the end of the first semester of the school year