

Marion County Public Schools

Francis Marion Military Academy



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 9 |
| Title I Requirements | 12 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 13 |

Francis Marion Military Academy

5895 SE 83RD ST, Ocala, FL 34472

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
| High School 9-12 | Yes | 76% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 47% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | D | D | D | D* |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Our mission at Marion Military Academy from 2008, the founding of the school states:

To provide high school students an opportunity to secure the highest quality education in an environment that embraces core military values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Marion Military Academy will establish an educational environment that addresses both district and state academic objectives, while providing all students a unique educational experience. By incorporating military principles into the school environment, the academy will instill in students the importance of self-discipline. Graduates from the academy will become the leaders of our community and our country.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| McCollum, James | Principal |
| Adair, Tommy | Administrative Support |
| West, Kimi | School Counselor |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Tom Adair - Administrator providing oversight to the educational program's fiscal responsibilities and supporting day to day operations of the educational program

Jim McCollum - Administrator overseeing educational program, curricula, instructional practice and assessment. This role includes management of student, supervision and evaluation of faculty and staff, student recruitment and maintaining parent contact regarding school program.

Dr, Kimi West - School Counselor overseeing scheduling, student academic records / performance assessment oversight, student recruitment

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 22 |
| 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 | 7 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 43 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 15 | 6 | 66 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|-----|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 36 | 29 | 23 | 119 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected

Wednesday 8/8/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 22 |
| 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 | 19 | 27 | 21 | 12 | 79 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 59 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 9 |

Year 2016-17 - 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 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 24 |
| 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 | 19 | 27 | 21 | 12 | 79 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 59 |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 33 | 30 | 8 | 109 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

L 25 significantly dropped in performance in ELA and Math. Trend? Yes

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

Math, L 25 57% to 0% *due to state data calculations requirements of less that 10 students in category*

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Math, L 25 (57% to 0%)

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Science, 40-55%, Trend? Yes

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

It appears to have been the individual teacher who was only here for the year.

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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 30% | 44% | 56% | 25% | 42% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | 48% | 53% | 31% | 40% | 46% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 31% | 37% | 44% | 31% | 30% | 38% |
| Math Achievement | 22% | 44% | 51% | 15% | 37% | 43% |
| Math Learning Gains | 24% | 42% | 48% | 24% | 35% | 39% |

| School Grade Component | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0% | 31% | 45% | 38% | 32% | 38% |
| Science Achievement | 55% | 60% | 67% | 62% | 63% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 46% | 67% | 71% | 43% | 65% | 69% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | Total |
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 (6) | 5 (8) | 6 (2) | 2 (6) | 22 (22) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 7 (19) | 12 (27) | 12 (21) | 12 (12) | 43 (79) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 15 (18) | 30 (11) | 15 (15) | 6 (15) | 66 (59) |

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 |
| 09 | 2018 | 18% | 46% | -28% | 53% | -35% |
| | 2017 | 29% | 46% | -17% | 52% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2018 | 36% | 46% | -10% | 53% | -17% |
| | 2017 | 27% | 43% | -16% | 50% | -23% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 52% | 61% | -9% | 65% | -13% |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2017 | 35% | 61% | -26% | 63% | -28% |
| Compare | | 17% | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| 2017 | | | | | |
| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 50% | 69% | -19% | 68% | -18% |
| 2017 | 52% | 71% | -19% | 67% | -15% |
| Compare | | -2% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 20% | 57% | -37% | 62% | -42% |
| 2017 | 18% | 53% | -35% | 60% | -42% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 56% | -15% |
| 2017 | 18% | 48% | -30% | 53% | -35% |
| Compare | | 23% | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 | 6 | 38 | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 18 | 70 | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 47 | | | | | 71 | 38 | | 60 | |
| WHT | 30 | 44 | | 36 | 19 | | 45 | 40 | | 85 | 18 |
| FRL | 28 | 52 | 31 | 15 | 21 | | 53 | 45 | | 50 | |
| 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 | | 42 | | | 36 | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | 30 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| BLK | 7 | 38 | | 13 | 54 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 52 | | 9 | 27 | | 9 | 20 | | | |
| WHT | 29 | 43 | | 20 | 27 | | 56 | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 47 | 53 | 14 | 29 | 52 | 42 | 47 | | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title ELA/Reading

Rationale

Literacy is the key to academic success and our performance data in this area relating to students who are entering the program with 1s and low 2s (as well as those who are currently participating in the program) demonstrates significant deficiencies in reading, writing and grammar. There appears to be a lack of standardization around literacy and best instructional practices across all disciplines and no formalized instructional format on developing reading skills for students who are significantly behind in this important area.

Intended Outcome

With new supports and targeted interventions that are connected to regular instruction and led by educators appropriately certified in the instructional area, we are confident that our lowest performing students will experience gains in reading in a manner that will secure a C grade for our school at the conclusion of the 2018 - 19 School Year. This will be achieved by increasing the four year average of our L25 population by 8% during the 2018 - 2019 School year.

Point Person

James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description

The mean student performance score on FSA ELA has been consistently low. This year's Freshman entering class is not only our largest class, it is also the highest performing with a mean score of 333.2, or low 2 performance level in this area. We must address this issue holistically across multiple content areas and through special instruction for our lowest performing students. To address this deficiency we have hired a Reading Teacher who will lead a Reading Support courses daily in addition to low performing students regular ELA class. All students who have not achieved a "3" on the FSA ELA will be required to take this course. We are also developing a Literary Canon of 32 novels that will be covered over the course of every student's four year, Humanities education at MMA. We have designed a two hour Friday Literacy support program with certified teachers and mentors working with students who are deficient in reading and / or preparing for graduation assessments. Reading is also integrated across all curricula in a manner consistent with Schmoker's practices. We have also integrated structured vocabulary / word study instruction in both reading and ELA classes and challenged other content areas to do the same. Finally, our JROTC leadership cadre has committed to providing tutoring within the structure of the remediation periods each Friday to specifically support students as they work toward greater reading abilities. Students will be pre-assessed at the beginning of the school year and periodically reassessed on internal measurements to monitor progress and plan interventions when improvement is not indicated.

Person Responsible

James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description

As the Principal of the school, I will monitor our implementation of our integrated reading initiative, the development of the Literary Canon and the integration of reading practices across the curricula. I will supervise the Friday intervention and remediation blocks and ensure the JROTC supports reading through a mentoring program they have committed to for this school year. I will also provide professional development opportunities weekly focused on Schmoker's book "Focus" and Lemov's book Teach Like a Champion to support greater literacy integration and more effective, consistent classroom management. We will work throughout this school year to standardize literacy instruction and assessment practices across our Humanities program.

Person Responsible James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2

Title Numeracy

Rationale Our students struggle with fundamental arithmetic as demonstrated on internal and external assessments. Without these foundational skills, accessing mathematics becomes extremely challenging. Our current instructional model has proven to be ineffective at ensuring the foundational skills and although we have demonstrated improvement in Algebra and geometry based on last years assessments, we did not move L25 students, students who lack fundamental arithmetic skills, in a way that benefit them as they move forward.

Intended Outcome As we implement supports and modify instructional practice, math competency and math confidence will improve and our students will become more willing to engage and learn the skills required to move forward through our math instructional sequence.

Point Person James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Action Step

Description We will pre-assess students at the beginning of the school year and develop interventions, both direct instructional practices and computer assisted programming, to help students develop foundation skills while in class. We will reassess at mid year and make adjustments to instruction based on our students' performance change during that time. In addition to regular math classes each day for 60 minutes, we will provide small group tutorials on Fridays during a two hour remediation block focused singularly on numeracy with specific targeted support focused on students in the L25. These will involve students being grouped based on the area of deficit they exhibit based on assessments. These support tutorials will also be augmented by mentors from our JROTC leadership cadre. Math will also target the issue of failure in the area of word problems by providing direct instruction on math vocabulary and foundation math skills reviews at the beginning of each class using the "Do-Now" system.

Person Responsible James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description All assessment scores will be reviewed and shared with math content teachers. Assessments from each instructional unit will be reviewed and deficit areas identified through review of performance will be targeted for remediation on Friday support days. Teachers will integrate math fundamental reviews / math vocabulary daily to assist students toward greater math fluency. These will be supervised via lesson plan review. Students will also benefit in math skills development from technology based learning opportunities (IXL.) The JROTC Leadership will assign tutors weekly and collaborate with school administrators on mentor relationships. We will measure our math improvement based on positive change from our current four year mean of 23% improvement in learning gains for our L25 (and our general population) on the FSA / Alg1 assessment. We will also measure increases in performance based on mean performance in the EOC in Geometry. Finally, we will measure the increase in the number of students choosing to access Algebra 2 after completing Algebra 1 and Geometry while attending MMA, as an additional measurement.

Person Responsible James McCollum (james.mccollum@marion.k12.fl.us)

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 Pilot SIP 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.

The schools mission, vision, and events are communicated to parents through the school website, social media account, Parent to Parent meetings, and Open House. The school will hold orientation, weekend picnics, and movie nights in order to foster a positive relationship with families and encourage involvement. Parents are encouraged to serve as school volunteers and chaperones in order to remain engaged and informed of their child's progress.

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.

- * Student Leadership Cadre provides mentoring and peer counseling
- * Check-in/Check-out system for select students
- * Mentors assigned to select students
- * The nature of the JROTC is inclusive and creates a team environment where all students feel a sense of belonging and have an adult mentor and peer mentors.
- * Providing 504 plans, Individual Education Plans (IEP), and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP)
- * Utilization of Behavior Specialist, Student Services, Social Workers, School Psychologist, and other district staff as necessary.
- * As a small school that has a focus on both team and leadership, our behavior rubric is inclusive of empathy and caring for one another. This is reinforced daily in our formations and classes.

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

- Francis Marion Charter Middle School, continues to be a feeder school to the high school.
- FMCMS and several other middle schools are visited to recruit students to attend MMA.
- We also recruit students with bilingual brochures to eligible eighth and ninth grade students.
- Transition of new students is facilitated by attending KIT (knowledge in training) camp, orientation and peer mentoring.
- MMA also has colleges visit, offers dual enrollment and promotes seeking a college education to its students.

The JROTC establishes student mentors for each entering cadet and serve on remediation days to support students academically.

- MMA administers the ASVAB to all eligible students.
- MMA supports all military recruiters visiting the school and giving the students opportunity to explore different branches.

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.

- The School-based Leadership Team will consistently monitor student achievement data and provide intervention opportunities to students as needed.
- Progress will be monitored and interventions will be adjusted based on student growth data.
- The school based team identifies areas in need of improvement and sets annual goals.
- An action plan is then created to address each goal area.
- The team meets periodically to set individual goals for students and to monitor student growth.
- Teachers are included in conversations about student growth and their professional growth needs are identified and prioritized through these conversations and results of team meetings.
- Data is consistently analyzed to adjust the action plan and to address new areas of need.
- E-Mail dissemination following each of the teacher meeting's

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

- College visits and Dual Enrollment Opportunities
 - ASVAB administration to all eligible students.
 - Military recruiter visits which give students the opportunity to explore different branches.
- The principal shall review each seniors transcript and discuss goals and aspirations at the beginning of the school year
- The guidance counselor will provide formal presentation of Florida scholarships at the midpoint of junior year and the beginning of senior year to each appropriate class
- A parent information evening will occur to provide parents and students information regarding college access and financial processes that assist in affording post-secondary education.

Part V: Budget

| | |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Total: | \$65,749.00 |
|---------------|--------------------|