

Volusia County Schools

Deltona Middle School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Deltona Middle School

250 ENTERPRISE RD, Deltona, FL 32725

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/deltonamiddle/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Feltner S

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	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: C (45%) 2020-21: (46%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: B (54%)
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	TS&I

* 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 Volusia 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The faculty, staff, and community of Deltona Middle School share the responsibility for guiding our students toward academic growth and emotional development essential for continued learning and lifelong success in a culturally diverse society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Deltona Middle School family is dedicated to the maximum growth of our students. By forming a partnership with our community, we create a caring and accepting environment for all. We rise to the challenge as we charge toward a positive tomorrow.

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
Williams, Kenisha	Principal	Oversee all operations of the school including: safety and security, community engagement , professional development ,teacher evaluation and leadership support for ELA and Social Studies
Goddard, Brian	Assistant Principal	ESE , MTSS & PBIS support for 6th grade team
Myers, Richard	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Security, Leadership support for Reading and Electives, PBIS support for 7th grade
Mason, Leotyne	Assistant Principal	Testing coordinator, SEL , PBIS, & MTSS

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/2/2022, Kimberly Feltner S

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,166

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

16

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

20

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	344	356	382	0	0	0	0	1082
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	90	134	0	0	0	0	320
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	85	96	0	0	0	0	247
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	36	12	0	0	0	0	66
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	10	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	159	155	0	0	0	0	420
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	153	150	0	0	0	0	447
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	90	50	0	0	0	0	216

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	104	126	132	0	0	0	0	362

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	5	9	2	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	3	0	0	0	0	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	386	365	383	0	0	0	0	1134
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	83	60	0	0	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	23	12	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	15	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	107	110	0	0	0	0	338
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	140	133	0	0	0	0	424
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	201	274	0	0	0	0	685

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	57	57	44	0	0	0	0	158

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	12	21	4	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	1	0	0	0	0	21

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	386	365	383	0	0	0	0	1134
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	83	60	0	0	0	0	201
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	23	12	0	0	0	0	51
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	15	0	0	0	0	66
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	107	110	0	0	0	0	338
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	151	140	133	0	0	0	0	424
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	210	201	274	0	0	0	0	685

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	57	57	44	0	0	0	0	158

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	12	21	4	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	1	0	0	0	0	21

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	38%			44%			46%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	41%			49%			54%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%			38%			44%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	38%			38%			47%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	48%			39%			48%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%			37%			41%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	46%			49%			55%	58%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	49%			55%			61%	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	46%	50%	-4%	54%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	46%	47%	-1%	52%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	50%	-6%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	40%	48%	-8%	55%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	52%	47%	5%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
08	2022					
	2019	18%	29%	-11%	46%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

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	52%	57%	-5%	48%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	59%	68%	-9%	71%	-12%
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	68%	54%	14%	61%	7%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	55%	45%	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	14	29	22	15	41	48	28	24			
ELL	26	36	31	31	52	51	31	29	79		
ASN	65	59		65	71						
BLK	20	25	26	26	48	55	23	43	15		
HSP	35	41	37	35	47	48	43	45	72		
MUL	51	41		37	46		75	54			
WHT	46	45	34	45	49	49	52	56	71		
FRL	35	39	33	33	47	50	41	46	58		
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	14	30	28	16	29	26	16	22			
ELL	25	40	33	28	31	34	27	39	50		

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
ASN	65	63		59	50						
BLK	35	50	38	26	35	44	37	43	41		
HSP	37	44	35	34	34	32	42	50	56		
MUL	53	71		31	33						
WHT	53	53	38	46	45	39	61	63	75		
FRL	39	46	36	34	35	35	44	52	57		

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	20	40	34	22	36	29	23	38			
ELL	30	44	38	30	41	36	26	40	55		
ASN	47	58		58	47						
BLK	42	54	55	44	40	27	52	46	81		
HSP	41	50	42	42	49	45	45	59	65		
MUL	47	52		45	43		69	57	40		
WHT	53	57	46	52	50	46	65	70	70		
FRL	43	52	43	44	46	40	52	57	66		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	65
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	51
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	50
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	45
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?

Compared to the last 4 years of data (2018-2022) overall proficiency in ELA, Math ,Science and Social Studies has decreased. In 2022, overall learning gains and learning gains of the lowest quartile in Math increased. Subgroup data shows ESE and African American performing significantly below their comparative peer groups.

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

Based off of progress monitoring and state assessments the areas which are greatest need for improvement is proficiency for all students in ELA , Math and Science as proficiency rates are below 50% .

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement are teacher retention and lack of structured interventions. To address the area of teacher retention, teachers will receive consistent and on-going support weekly from content area coaches and administration. To address the lack of structured interventions, teachers will be provided professional development on using formative assessments to design small group intervention , as well as they will receive targeted actionable feedback on how to use data to implement research based intervention strategies.

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

The data components which showed the most improvement was the overall learning gains in math and learning gains of the lowest quartile. There was an increase in overall math learning gains from 39% to 48% , and there was an increase in the lowest quartile learning gains from 37% to 50%.

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

The contributing factors were teacher collaboration and targeted differentiated instruction based on data.

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

The strategies which will need to be implemented to accelerate learning are targeted PD during PLC's, support from content area coaches (model lessons, data analysis) student data chats, using formative data to drive re-teach.

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.

Professional Development which will be provided is using formative data to drive re-teach instruction, how to incorporate small group targeted instruction, and MTSS/PBIS to build strong student relationships.

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

To ensure sustainability we will focus on building a strong school culture through collaboration, coaching and high expectations and accountability for all students.

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

This area was chosen because trend data from the last 4 years shows a decrease in overall proficiency in the core content areas of ELA, Math and Science,

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

Increase ELA and Math proficiency from 38% to 43 %
 Increase Science proficiency from 46% to 51%

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

Teacher practice will be measured by 85% of teachers using formative assessment data to drive instruction as evidenced by lesson plans and classroom walkthrough data.

This area of focused will be measured by classroom walkthroughs, PLC lesson planning and student performance on school, district and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenisha Williams (kmwilli3@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

The school will provide professional development on standards based instruction with the alignment of student task when developing lesson plans.

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

The rationale for selecting this strategy is for teachers to be able to plan lessons which are standards aligned with student expected task.

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.

The leadership team will conduct classroom walkthroughs focused on the following look-fors:
 Bell work- aligned to trailing or current standard
 Learning Target - relevant to lesson
 Success Criteria
 Check for understanding
 Student task aligned with learning target
 Team expectations for behavior

Person Responsible

Kenisha Williams (kmwilli3@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC Lesson Planning
 Classroom walkthroughs

Person Responsible

Kenisha Williams (kmwilli3@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Discipline

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

Discipline data shows that 368 referrals were written during the 2021-2022 school year, of which 87 were for campus disruption and 81 school rules violation.

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

The measurable outcome is to reduce the number of discipline referrals for campus disruption and school rules by 50% , which would decrease campus disruption to 43 and school rules violation to 40.

Teacher practice outcome will be measured by 75% of teachers implementing PBIS strategies through the PBIS rewards app.

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

This area of focus will be monitored through monthly discipline reports and teacher use of the PBIS rewards app.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kenisha Williams (kmwilli3@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

The evidence based strategy will be restorative practices and PBIS.

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

The rationale for selecting restorative practices is research shows that it builds positive relationships, encourages responsibility and builds a community of respectful learners. The rationale for selecting PBIS is research shows that it improves school culture, safety and reduces suspensions.

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.

Teachers will be trained on PBIS.

Restorative practice will be utilized to reduce out of school suspension and teach students problem solving strategies.

Students will earn points and rewards for positive behavior through the PBIS rewards app.

Person Responsible Leotyne Mason (lsmason@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. 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.

Students with disabilities was the lowest performing subgroup with only 28% of students showing proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase proficiency by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs, school, district and state progress monitoring data. Data discussion during Professional Learning Communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The school will provide PD on UDL strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The rationale is for teachers to be able to analyze various sets of data to develop lesson plans which address the diverse needs of their students with the intent to increase student mastery of standards.

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.

Provide PD on UDL

Person Responsible

Brian Goddard (bgoddard@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Lesson Planning and Data Chats during PLC

Person Responsible

Kenisha Williams (kmwilli3@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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.

PBIS reward system
Monthly staff celebrations
Building relationships
TEAM activities
Family Nights

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

School Administration team - Implement Systems of Support through PBIS
Teachers- Build relationships with students, on-going communication with parents
Students- Follow school and classroom expectations
Parents- Attend family nights, support student academic and social growth