

Citrus County Schools

# Lecanto Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Lecanto Middle School

3800 W EDUCATIONAL PATH, Lecanto, FL 34461

<https://lms.citruschools.org/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Inge Frederick**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Citrus 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](http://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

We believe at LMS that together we will achieve excellence through culture, innovation, and rigor. We can, we care, we connect, we are LMS

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Excellence for everyone everyday.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frederick, Inge	Principal	
Stukes, Tony	Assistant Principal	
Goolsby, Dianna	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Inge Frederick

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

40

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8

<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	64%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

**The number of students by 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	293	282	262	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	38	36	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	51	38	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	31	16	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	28	38	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	44	33	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	39	38	0	0	0	0	123

**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	45	62	51	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	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 7/21/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

**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	283	262	266	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	90	115	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	48	52	0	0	0	0	114
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	6	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	86	103	0	0	0	0	232

**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	31	56	46	0	0	0	0	133

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4

**Prior Year - Updated**

**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	283	262	266	0	0	0	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	90	115	0	0	0	0	238
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	48	52	0	0	0	0	114
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5	6	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	86	103	0	0	0	0	232

**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	31	56	46	0	0	0	0	133

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	56%	54%	61%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	53%	54%	58%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	46%	47%	53%	46%	47%
Math Achievement	65%	62%	58%	65%	64%	58%
Math Learning Gains	56%	54%	57%	50%	55%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	44%	51%	49%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	55%	51%	63%	56%	52%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	76%	76%	72%	75%	73%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total		
	6	7	8			
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)		

**Grade Level Data**  
**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	2019	56%	52%	4%	54%	2%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	55%	0%	52%	3%
	2018	59%	49%	10%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	56%	51%	5%	55%	1%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	62%	0%	54%	8%
	2018	72%	59%	13%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	49%	49%	0%	46%	3%
	2018	43%	48%	-5%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	63%	52%	11%	48%	15%
	2018	60%	53%	7%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	74%	1%	71%	4%
2018	75%	71%	4%	71%	4%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	70%	27%	61%	36%
2018	80%	65%	15%	62%	18%
Compare		17%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	52%	48%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	35	24	29	44	37	33	50			
ASN	96	78		100	89			100	94		

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
BLK	46	54	55	32	32	27					
HSP	47	52	42	55	61	67	57	67	50		
MUL	43	37		60	63						
WHT	57	47	35	65	54	48	68	77	54		
FRL	49	45	38	58	52	51	60	67	34		

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	53	46	38	42	32	35	50			
ASN	93	79		100	75		73		90		
BLK	46	48		57	39	30					
HSP	54	48	56	55	48	36	55	65	61		
MUL	55	61		55	39						
WHT	61	58	52	65	49	52	66	77	54		
FRL	53	53	51	59	48	47	58	69	49		

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	57
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
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	

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	41
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## **Analysis**

### **Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

(2019 Data) SWD.

Master schedule was changed for these students to include a second teacher rather than a third period of intervention.

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

(2019 Data) ELA learning gains BQ.

Master schedule was changed for these students to include a second teacher rather than a third period of intervention.

#### **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**

(2019 Data) learning gains BQ.

Master schedule was changed for these students to include a second teacher rather than a third period of intervention.

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

(2019 Data) Student achievement in Math (including learning gains).

Selection of a student intervention program (ALEKS). This year the District has moved away from ALEKS as a Math Intervention and we will be using the ACHIEVE 3000 math program.

#### **Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

Attendance

Discipline

\*\* Due to health concerns and the need for more frequent absences due to COVID-19, we will not be creating an Attendance Goal for the 2020-2021 school year in our SIP.

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

1. Increase student achievement of SWD BQ in ELA.
2. Increase student achievement of SWD BQ in Math
3. Decrease student referrals.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** State assessment data from Spring 2019 (last available data points) demonstrated that learning gains in ELA dropped from 58% to 48% and learning gains for our lowest 25% dropped from 53% to 38%.

**Measureable Outcome:** 60% of all students will make learning gains in ELA. 60% of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains,

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students in the lowest 25% will receive 2 periods of ELA and 1 period of reading intervention utilizing Achieve 3000 or Extreme Reading, research-based reading intervention programs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Achieve 3000 is an online program that provides an individualized instructional program tailored to each student's current Lexile Level. The program scaffolds to grade-level reading passages and mastery of the standards. Extreme Reading is an additional Intensive Reading program being used this year as a paper-based intervention for a sub-section of Intensive Reading students who require a different intervention.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Instructional staff will participate in The Fundamental 5 Refresher Training. The LMS Classroom Walk Through Tool, used by administrators, will be updated to include all 5 components of The Fundamental 5 and will provide teachers input on how they are using the strategies in the classroom.

**Person Responsible** Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

2. Department-alike teams will create common lesson plan forms which include the following information: Learning Objective, Standards, Teaching Strategies, We Will, I Will statements, lesson being taught by teacher, assignments, ESOL/504/ESE Accommodations, and AVID WICOR strategies.

**Person Responsible** Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

3. Grade-Level Department Teams will create Citrus Formative Assessment & USA Test Prep schedules to assure that all CFAs & Diagnostic assessments are administered and data reviewed.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Filipic (filipick@citruschools.org)

4. Department and Team Meetings will be Student, Strategy, & Student Work focused. Agendas will be posted and updated in the LMS Google Drive.

**Person Responsible** Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

5. Teachers in state tested subjects will participate in 3 data days focused on Citrus Formative Assessment & USA Test Prep data analysis and standards mastery review.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Filipic (filipick@citruschools.org)

6. Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)

\*Two SEL lessons per month from School Connect, an online SEL program

**Person Responsible** Mindy Melito (melitom@citruschools.org)



## #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our SWD have performed below their non-disabled peers in both ELA and math. The Federal Index was 34% for SWD.

**Measureable Outcome:** 42% of SWD will be proficient (3 or higher) on the FSA ELA and mathematics assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tony Stukes (stukest@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will be placed in the least restrictive environment with highly qualified teachers and tiered supports.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Data supports that students achieve at higher levels of proficiency when provided with specially designed instruction in classrooms with their non-disabled peers.

### Action Steps to Implement

All action steps from the "learning gains in ELA" area of focus, plus...

1. Co-teacher teams will receive professional development on best practices for supporting students in an inclusion classroom.

**Person Responsible** Vicky McCraine (mccrainev@citruschools.org)

2. Teachers will receive professional development from the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) to acquire SIM strategies.

**Person Responsible** Vicky McCraine (mccrainev@citruschools.org)

3. The master schedule will be designed around the needs of SWD in order to provide them with supports in the least restrictive environments.

**Person Responsible** Vicky McCraine (mccrainev@citruschools.org)

4. Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

\*Two SEL lessons per month from School Connect, an online SEL program

**Person Responsible** Mindy Melito (melitom@citruschools.org)

5. All generally assessed SWD will be mentored by a member of the leadership team including student conferences on at least a monthly basis.

**Person Responsible** Inge Frederick (fredericki@citruschools.org)

6. All SWD will have a case manager who will progress monitor on a monthly basis throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible** Vicky McCraine (mccrainev@citruschools.org)

7. A continuum of services will be available, including learning strategies, social-skills, and reading courses taught by an ESE teacher.

**Person Responsible** Vicky McCraine (mccrainev@citruschools.org)

### #3. Other specifically relating to Number of Student Days in In-School Suspension and Out-of-School Suspension

#### Area of Focus

#### Description and Rationale:

During the 2019-2020 school year, it was projected that 18.8% of LMS students received ISS and 11% of LMS students received OSS.

#### Measurable Outcome:

The number of LMS students who serve ISS will decrease by 5%.  
The number of LMS students who serve OSS will decrease by 5%.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

#### Evidence-based Strategy:

Implementing a school-wide focus on restorative practices with the aim of providing methods for students to make amends, build stronger relationships, and return to class.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

One of the goals of restorative justice practices is to restore relationships to their previous status, before the conflict, and when possible make them even stronger. By doing this, we will prevent many of the conflicts that occur between middle school students that result in a discipline referral and class time lost to ISS and OSS.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Assure Administration works closely with Guidance Office so that School Counselors can intervene with students prior to referrals being written.

#### Person Responsible

Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

2. Student discipline data will be tracked and monitored at weekly Administrative Core Team Meetings and Intervention Plans will be developed for students who receive more than 1 Major Office Discipline Referral.

#### Person Responsible

Dianna Goolsby (goolsbyd@citruschools.org)

3. Implementation of a Peer Mediation Program where minor conflicts are first addressed by trained student peers.

#### Person Responsible

Joseph Benedetto (benedettoj@citruschools.org)

4. Implementation of School-Connect program twice-monthly (social and emotional lessons)

#### Person Responsible

Mindy Melito (melitom@citruschools.org)

5. Implementation of School-Connect program twice-monthly (social and emotional lessons)

#### Person Responsible

Joseph Benedetto (benedettoj@citruschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**N/A**

## Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

1. At LMS we create meaningful parent involvement that allows families to feel part of our school community.
2. At LMS we focus on recognizing both students and staff achievements and do so both publicly and privately.
3. At LMS we have established school norms that build values. These norms are our ROAR Core Values: Respect, On-Task, Attitude, & Responsibility
4. At LMS we continually strive to set and enforce consistent rules and expectations throughout campus.
5. At LMS we engage students in ways that benefit them. We seek their input through a multitude of methods and consult student body leaders to help drive the changes that students identify as a need.
6. At LMS we work with teacher leaders to continually revisit our processes, procedures, and structures and make changes as needs are identified.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.