

Duval County Public Schools

Pretrial Detention Facility



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Pretrial Detention Facility

2335 W 18TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

<http://www.duvalschools.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Edward Robinson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2014

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Pretrial Detention Facility

2335 W 18TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

<http://www.duvalschools.org/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p> <p>Grade</p>	<p>2011-12</p>
--	-----------------------

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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.

To establish a highly academic environment that will foster the academic success of all students while participating in a Department of Juvenile Justice Program or Neglected and at risk program. This will ensure that every student is provided educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, everyday.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will be provided a safe and nurturing community so that every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Robinson, Edward	Principal	Principal: Instructional and operational leadership. This includes progress monitoring, teacher evaluations and instructional walk-through. Community involvement meetings with all stakeholders is scheduled monthly along with bi-weekly leadership team meetings.
Bell, Faye	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor: Academic and student resource and academic support. This includes credit checks, transcript evaluations and regular academic monitoring for students in the program.
Parker, LaTonya	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal: Instructional and operational leadership. This includes progress monitoring, teacher evaluations and instructional walk-through. Community involvement meetings with all stakeholders is scheduled monthly along with bi-weekly leadership team meetings.
Doran, Thomas	Registrar	Scheduling students according to their grade level academic plan. This includes FASTER request, school counselor recommendations and testing history.

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	0	1	1	14	21	16	15	68
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	7	9	31
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	9	11	41

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	1	1	14	21	16	15	68

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	7	6	5	6	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	11	6	9	41

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	2	5	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	7	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	2	13	26

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	2	10	1	10	23

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	0%	47%	56%	0%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	48%	51%	0%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	42%	0%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	68%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	14 (0)	21 (0)	16 (0)	15 (0)	68 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	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 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (0)	9 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	31 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)	12 (0)	9 (0)	11 (0)	41 (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.

NOTE: 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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	0%	44%	-44%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	49%	-49%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	15%	49%	-34%	53%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	48%	-48%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	63%	-63%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	68%	-39%	70%	-41%
2018	18%	64%	-46%	68%	-50%
Compare		11%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
2018	14%	57%	-43%	56%	-42%
Compare		-14%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD											
BLK								18			
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	29
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	0
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Asian Students

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Black/African American Students

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	9
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The ELA data showed the lowest performance. The contributing factors include but not limited to multiple grade levels behind; attendance; inappropriate behaviors; juvenile delinquency; and foster care.

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

Math showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The contributing factors include but not limited to multiple grade levels behind; attendance; inappropriate behaviors; juvenile delinquency; and foster care

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.

Math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Youth Development Math average for 2018-19 school year was 23%. The contributing factors to this achievement gap are students come multiple grade levels behind, have poor attendance, exemplified poor behavior both academically and socially, are involved with juvenile delinquency and are part of the Foster Care System.

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

Reading and promotion and graduation rates showed the most improvement in our programs. When students are enrolled they get a credit check within 3 days of enrollment. The student is then enrolled in all classes that will work toward graduation requirements only. (No enrollment in classes that can't assist in meeting graduation requirement)

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Reading and Math is the major concern for Youth Development Programs. They are the main contributing factors for meeting promotion and graduation requirements. We have a major focus in these areas and are utilizing the district's academic platforms for remediation, grade recovery and promotion.

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

1. Graduation rate
2. Promotion rate
3. Reading gains
4. Math gains
5. Grade recovery

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Differentiation of instruction in Math and Reading will be the areas of focus for the upcoming school year. If this area improves so will student achievement.
Rationale	Teachers have multiple preparations of subject area content; Example: M/J 2, Algebra 1, Algebra 2, Geometry and Liberal Arts Math taught simultaneously.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcomes will be shown by improved WIN Assessment scores, Math gains on district and state EOC assessments, and improved promotion rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alicia Lloyd (lloyda1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will use PLATO instructional software and District provided blended learning to enhance the instructional outcomes of the students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Due to the high number of course preparations by each teacher, these researched based strategies will assist in the differentiation of instruction for all the teachers. These strategy will ensure that all students are provided with state aligned subject area content daily.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development to support student engagement and differentiation. 2. Quarterly Professional Development will be provided to assist teachers in cross-curricular lesson plan development 3. Teachers will incorporate the four (4) pillars of instruction, (Full engagement, rigorous content, student ownership, and demonstration of student learning), with an emphasis on student engagement. 4. Early Dismissal Professional Development will be used to development multiple strategies for lesson plan development. 5. Early Dismissal <p>Early dismissal days will be used for teacher collaboration and provide the opportunity for teachers to learn differentiation strategies used in various classrooms.</p>
Person Responsible	LaTonya Parker (parkerl@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Multiple Tiered System of Support (MTSS) strategies will used to improve African American and Exceptional Education students in Reading and Math.
Rationale	Evidence showed that African American students and Exceptional Education students did not meet the 41% threshold for the 2018-2019 school year. To address this area of concern, strategic strategies will be implemented to increase student achievement in the areas of Reading and Math.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcomes will be shown by a 5% improvement in Math and Reading gains on district and state End-of Course assessments (EOC) and improved promotion rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elisa Ingram (ingrame@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Multiple Tiered System of Support (MTSS) will be used with African American and Exceptional Education Students. This will include teacher pullouts and strategic progress monitoring of the specified sub-group and regular Data Chats with the school counselor. IEP monitoring and specific educational strategies will be monitored, and Standards based walkthroughs will be completed monthly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS has shown to improve student achievement. This strategy will ensure that every student has the opportunity for academic support as needed to increase academic performance. Small group instruction that targets specific academic areas will be implemented and monitored bi-weekly.

Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development to support student differentiation and scaffolding. 2. Quarterly Professional Development will be provided to assist teachers in lesson plan development 3. ESE teachers will collaborate with all teachers with an emphasis on student engagement and various academic strategies. 4. Pullout and push in strategies will be used for African American and ESE students as needed. Students will identified weekly during the Professional Learning Community Meetings (PLC'S) and a academic plan will be created for that standard. 5. Early dismissal days will be used for teacher collaboration and provide the opportunity for teachers to plan differentiation strategies used in various classrooms targeting African American and Exceptional Education students.
Person Responsible	Edward Robinson (robinsone2@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Student with Disabilities
Rationale	Evidence showed that students with learning disabilities did not meet the 41% threshold for the 2018-2019 school year. To address this area of concern, strategic strategies will be implemented to increase student academic achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcomes will be shown by a 5% improvement in Math and Reading gains on district and state End-of Course assessments (EOC) and improved promotion rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elisa Ingram (ingrame@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Intervention practices for students with disabilities will include a sequential, simultaneous structured multi-sensory approach, direct instruction and activities to assess individual students to monitor their progress through the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Specific, directed, individualized, and intensive remedial instruction using multi-sensory approach has shown to improve student achievement. Applying the strategies will ensure that every student has the opportunity for academic support as needed to increase academic performance. Small group instruction that targets specific academic areas will be implemented and monitored bi-weekly.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ESE teachers will collaborate with all teachers with an emphasis on student engagement and various academic strategies. 2. Quarterly Professional Development will be provided to assist teachers in lesson plan development. 3. IEP monitoring and specific educational strategies will be monitored, and Standards based walk-through's will be completed monthly. 4. Review and discuss Learning Disabilities Association-LDA's technical publication oriented toward professionals in the field of learning disabilities. 5. Review resources from a selection of websites with the latest information on teaching students with learning disabilities (All Kinds of Minds, Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice; and Teaching LD).
Person Responsible	Edward Robinson (robinsone2@duvalschools.org)

#4	
Title	African American Males
Rationale	Evidence showed that African American male students did not meet the 41% threshold for the 2018-2019 school year. To address this area of concern, strategic strategies will be implemented to increase student achievement in the areas of Reading and Math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcomes will be shown by a 5% improvement in Math and Reading gains on district and state End-of Course assessments (EOC) and improved promotion rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Michael Stull (stullm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit instruction, scaffolding, and a structured multi-sensory approach will be used with African American Male students. This will include teacher pullouts, strategic progress monitoring, and regular Data Chats with the school counselor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Explicit instruction, scaffolding, and a structured multi-sensory approach has shown to improve student achievement in Reading and Math. This strategy will ensure that every student has the opportunity for academic support to increase academic performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development to support student differentiation and scaffolding. 2. Quarterly Professional Development will be provided to assist teachers in lesson plan development. 3. Early dismissal days will be used for teacher collaboration and provide the opportunity for teachers to plan differentiation strategies used in various classrooms targeting African American Male students. 4. Review and discuss technical publications oriented toward professionals in the field of low performing students. 5.
Person Responsible	Edward Robinson (robinsonsone2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

NA

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

NA

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

NA

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

NA

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Differentiation of instruction in Math and Reading will be the areas of focus for the upcoming school year. If this area improves so will student achievement.	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Multiple Tiered System of Support (MTSS) strategies will used to improve African American and Exceptional Education students in Reading and Math.	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: African American Males	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00