Thornebrooke Elementary

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Thornebrooke Elementary

601 THORNEBROOKE DR, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://thornebrookees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Korey Bawden

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2010

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2018-19 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	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (71%) 2014-15: A (84%)
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	N/A
* 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 Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Thornebrooke Elementary

601 THORNEBROOKE DR, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://thornebrookees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	30%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	46%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To lead our students to success with the support and involvement of families and the community

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation

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
Daniels, Christopher	Principal	Christopher Daniels – Principal * The entire operation of the school * Instructional coach and supervision * Assistance to all staff * Marzano/ I-Observation * Data collection and analysis * SIP * Assessments * Writing * Approve all Leave Forms * School Budget * School liaison for PTO and SAC * Staff Duty Roster * Master Schedule * MTSS * PLC participant * Lesson plans * School inservice * Other duties as assigned by the Area Superintendent
Honis, Susan	Instructional Coach	Susie Honis– Resource/CRT * Principal's Designee in the absence of the principal and Asst. Principal * Testing Coordinator * Instructional coach and supervision * Data collection and analysis * Maintain Instructional Resource Room * Reading tutoring * MTSS Coach * OCPS coach meetings * Provide assistance to teachers in the areas of curriculum, instruction and assessment * Tutoring/Saturday School Coordinator * PLC participant * Plan, implement, and evaluate in-service activities for the school * Evaluate and recommend professional literature and activities for faculty and staff. * Serves on School Advisory Council *DPLC representative *other duties as assigned by the Principal
DiMaggio, Kimberly	Other	Kim DiMaggio- Resource/Math * Math specialist * Florida Core liaison * Data collection and analysis * I-Ready monitoring * Student Incentives * Professional Development * PLC participant

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		* Deliberate Practice liaison * Instructional rounds * Professional Development * Assist teachers with math curriculum * MTSS * Provide assistance to teacher in the areas of curriculum, instruction and assessment * Plan, implement, and evaluate in-service activities for the school * Math Interventions * Other duties as assigned by the principal
Dobson, Ann	Instructional Media	Ann Dobson-Media Specialist * Entire operation of the Media Center * Classes based on sign up * Specialized Lessons for K-5 * Sunshine State Book Club * Instructional Technology * Textbook Coordinator * Accelerated Reader * Barracuda Bytes * SAC * Guest Authors * National Elementary Honor Society * Media materials * Instructional media assistance * Girls on the Run * 5 Star Photo documentation * News Crew * Literacy Committee * Website updates * Fixed Assets Property Manager * Technology back-up and technology staff trainer * Other duties as assigned by the principal
Goodman, Felecia	Assistant Principal	Felecia Goodman- Assistant Principal * Principal's designee * Assist in entire operation of the school * School discipline, referrals for all grades and buses * Discipline data and ISS/PASS if needed * SAC representative * PIE co-coordinator * 5-Star co-representative * Bus duty * Approve leave forms * MTSS rep * Custodial issues * Marzano observations * Deliberate Practice * Budget

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		* Maintenance * Classified Evaluations * School Surveys * School Improvement Plan * Support for ELL students * ELL testing * Other duties as assigned
Green, Leslee	Other	*Coordinate ESE compliance *Schedule and conduct staffing, EPT, IEP, 504 and annual review meetings *Coordinate with Registrar student registration compliance *Liaison for TES, the West Learning Community and District Office for ESE *Assists with the inclusion of ESE students *Assist in scheduling of ESE students, ESE teachers, and paraprofessionals *Attend district and learning community Staffing Coordinator meetings *MTSS team *Data collection and analysis *Assist with ELL compliance as needed *Other duties as assigned by the principal
Miller, Jane	School Counselor	*Conducts individual, group and crisis counseling for students, parents and staff *Conducts classroom guidance lessons *Character Ed Shows *Co-Responsible for DCF concerns or questions *Bully Prevention *MTSS team *Health/Sanford Harmony facilitator *Monitor and support ELL testing for students as needed *Other duties as assigned by the principal

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	115	101	122	109	121	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	706
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	1	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

48

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/18/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	12	6	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	1	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	4	4	12	6	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	1	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	85%	57%	57%	80%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	58%	58%	69%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	63%	76%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	64%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	48%	51%	46%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	56%	53%	68%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	115 (0)	101 (0)	122 (0)	109 (0)	121 (0)	138 (0)	706 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 (4)	7 (4)	1 (12)	5 (6)	5 (11)	8 (5)	33 (42)
One or more suspensions	1 (2)	0 (1)	2 (1)	1 (1)	2 (4)	4 (2)	10 (11)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (1)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (14)	16 (20)	12 (18)	39 (52)

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**	
03	2019	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%	
	2018	82%	55%	27%	57%	25%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	84%	57%	27%	58%	26%	
	2018	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					
05	2019	85%	54%	31%	56%	29%	
	2018	83%	55%	28%	55%	28%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%	
	2018	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	87%	63%	24%	64%	23%	
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	84%	57%	27%	60%	24%	
	2018	82%	59%	23%	61%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		5%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	79%	54%	25%	53%	26%	
	2018	74%	53%	21%	55%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		5%					
Cohort Comparison							

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	28	43	31	38	65	65	50				

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
ELL	73	82	71	83	79	76	47				
ASN	79	86		91	100		93				
BLK	79	58	45	73	50	42	55				
HSP	77	73	76	78	77	77	62				
WHT	91	78	59	89	74	69	91				
FRL	71	61	45	70	70	66	64				

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
SWD	29	44	43	26	35	17	27				
ELL	65	66	65	74	72	60					
ASN	87	72		95	83		88				
BLK	70	57	40	63	50	23	53				
HSP	76	67	44	78	69	55	60				
WHT	87	69	61	87	70	48	82				
FRL	72	65	52	69	60	46	58				

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
SWD	39	52	38	31	33	20	36				
ELL	51	48	50	57	63	67					
ASN	81	58		92	77		90				
BLK	78	78	69	48	48	38	50				
HSP	69	60	39	66	51	43	55				
WHT	85	74	65	82	69	54	72				
FRL	69	61	51	56	55	44	39				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

Based on the 2019 school data, ELA Lowest 25% had the lowest performance even while this area gained 8 points. The two contributing factors are these students receive ESE services and many are second language learners. Through analysis of these students, the sub-group of students with disabilities is also a specific area to improve.

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

All data components showed increases.

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.

For 2018-2019, all data components were above the state average. Initiatives put in place in 2018-2019 will be continued for 2019-2020.

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

Math Lowest 25% learning gain experienced the greatest improvement with a 25% gain. Grade levels utilized a wide variety of resources and worked together in PLCs to fully understand the state math standards at higher levels. Also, additional instructional personnel supported the implementation of math lesson plans and provided remediation for students. Finally, some strategic staff changes also had a large impact.

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

Based on the EWS data, students with disabilities at 46% and Black at 57% are the two lowest groups. Current programs and monitoring pieces will remain in place to support students who have any EWS indicators while better using the skills learned from cultural responsiveness to help the students.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2. Students with disabilities
3. Black students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
Rationale	Based on the 2019 school data, ELA Lowest 25% had the smallest amount of gain. Through analysis of these students, the sub-group of students with disabilities is a specific area to target for improvement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For the 2019-2020 school year, it is expected to increase the learning gains of the FSA ELA Lowest 25% by three percentage points to 66%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	To use the skills learned from our county DPLC training to specifically target the student in the lowest 25% for ELA while using and providing scaffolded supports, and differentiated teaching and learning. A goal of 70% or higher proficiency on work in ELA is the level of evidence expected. Common assessments in ELA, iReady Diagnostic/Growth Monitoring tools and Reading Plus performance will be monitored monthly.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Scaffolded supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks that they cannot yet do independently and with a high rate of success. Teachers select powerful visual, verbal and written supports; carefully calibrate them to students' performance and understanding in relation to learning tasks; use them flexibly; evaluate their effectiveness; and gradually remove them once they are no longer needed. Some supports are planned prior to lessons and some are provided responsively during instruction.

Action Step	
Description	1. Continued professional development will be provided addressing cultural responsiveness to support the diversity in this ELA Lowest 25% subgroup. Ms. Goodman will provide help and skills learned through district initiatives in this area. 2. Common assessments in ELA, iReady Diagnostic/Growth Monitoring tools and Reading Plus performance will be monitored quarterly with the data used to adjust instruction. 3. Using the information from the BPIE Assessment, we will refine support facilitation and monitoring. SWD will learn and use the skills and processes to make gains toward grade level performance. 4. Remediation will take place in small group sessions as needed based on the data.
Person Responsible	Felecia Goodman (felecia.goodman@ocps.net)

#2	
Title	Improving student achievement in ELA
Rationale	With the initiatives of the DPLC for 2019-2020, an increase in the expertise of student writing will positively impact comprehension for students. With explicit instruction for writing, student vocabulary and synthesizing of information will increase.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For the 2019-2020 school year, student achievement is expected to increase by three percentage points on the ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students will generate inferences and elaborate to provide evidence that demonstrates understanding of learned content through writing and academic conversations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, learners must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, students, and the content.
Action Step	
Description	1. Professional Development will be provided by DPLC representatives to include academic conversations, text dependent questions and other DPLC initiatives. The DPLC team will provide trainings three times throughout the academic year. 2. Within PLCs, teachers will create common lesson plans and assessments to include text dependent questions and text dependent writing tasks. 3. In addition to DPLC strategies, teachers will utilize Write Score to supplement instruction in writing. Write Score assessments will be analyzed two times a year to remediate and target specific strengths and areas of improvement for all students. 4. Classroom observations will be conducted and feedback provided to ensure professional development is becoming instructional practice. Writing will be monitored formally and informally. Teachers will monitor all writing and Write Score will be used for more precise and objective writing data collection and support.
Person Responsible	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)

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).

NA

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improving student achievement in ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00