Florida Virtual High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Florida Virtual High School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

Demographics

Principal: Daniele Shick

Start Date for this Principal: 3/6/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	32%
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: B (57%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual 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

Florida Virtual High School

5422 CARRIER DR., Orlando, FL 32819

www.flvsft.com

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)
High School 9-12	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	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the FL Virtual 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.

Mission: To deliver a high quality, technology-based education that provides the skills and knowledge students need for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: To transform education worldwide – one student at a time.

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
Henson, Kenneth	Principal	The Principal provides instructional leadership for the planning, management, operation and evaluation of the FLVS FT School. The Principal manages Instructional Leaders, ensuring that they work with teachers to ensure that each child successfully completes his/her instruction program. The Principal manages the overall school operation working with parents, students, support staff and certified teachers who "virtually" facilitate a student instructional program.
Fisher, Alison	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.
Shick, Daniele	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.
Simpson, Wil	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.
Anderson, Curry	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal, under the direction of the Principal, assists in managing the FLVS FT School and its human resources to attain school goals by providing evidence of effective instruction that results in student achievement, as recognized through defined learning gains and survey results. The Assistant Principal supports the instructional process with specific responsibility for managing assigned programs/services; providing information /serving as a resource to others; and supervising assigned staff. The Assistant Principal will also oversee personal and professional growth activities of assigned staff.

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	0	0	571	688	707	812	2778
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	

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	
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)

83

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/21/2019

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	71%	71%	56%	71%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	59%	51%	61%	0%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	39%	42%	48%	0%	41%
Math Achievement	53%	53%	51%	60%	0%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	48%	48%	54%	0%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	27%	45%	42%	0%	39%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	81%	81%	68%	66%	0%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	84%	84%	73%	78%	0%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	571 (0)	688 (0)	707 (0)	812 (0)	2778 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	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.

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
09	2019	74%	74%	0%	55%	19%
	2018	78%	78%	0%	53%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	70%	70%	0%	53%	17%
	2018	72%	72%	0%	53%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

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
2019	80%	83%	-3%	67%	13%
2018	84%	84%	0%	65%	19%
Compare		-4%			

CIVICS EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	81%	81%	0%	71%	10%

HISTORY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	83%	0%	70%	13%
2018	85%	85%	0%	68%	17%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	64%	-17%	61%	-14%
2018	70%	70%	0%	62%	8%
Compare		-23%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	59%	-3%	57%	-1%
2018	69%	69%	0%	56%	13%
Compare		-13%			

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	31	43	28	32	39	27	54	48		88	14
ASN	79	64		68	35		88	80		85	35
BLK	72	57	30	37	37	32	65	83		80	36
HSP	66	58	37	47	38	15	79	77		82	30
MUL	80	64		61	71		86	89		86	42
WHT	72	60	40	56	52	34	83	86		81	30
FRL	68	56	33	48	42	22	82	79		79	27

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	36	48	43	33	46	45	27	47		79	15
ASN	89	70		88	62		94	83	100	70	19
BLK	67	63	54	48	53	50	62	72	61	66	20
HSP	73	61	52	58	53	51	64	80	54	68	28
MUL	82	59	48	66	47	44	69	86	55	67	25
WHT	75	59	54	64	53	46	77	87	64	67	27
FRL	68	60	52	54	52	45	67	76	51	64	28

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	40	51	38	26	35	31	36	47	8	85	4
ELL	46	57		58	45						
ASN	74	64		69	61		79	75	82	69	
BLK	62	61	51	44	49	31	60	73	39	65	15
HSP	69	64	49	55	51	38	59	75	34	66	25
MUL	71	61	57	63	60	45	69	81	33	58	24
WHT	73	60	47	62	56	45	69	80	36	67	25
FRL	64	58	49	53	55	43	58	73	29	62	15

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	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	67
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	53
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	53
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	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
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	54
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.

The Algebra 1 re-taker passing rate was 36% which is 2% higher than the state but the lowest performance of all our state assessments. Contributing factors include a significant increase in enrollment population of students who need additional math academic support as evidenced by an increase in students with IEPs, 504, and past test scores below proficiency. An adjustment to our district progression plan last year placed Algebra 1 re-takers into geometry instead of a math course where students had the opportunity to stress and emphasize Algebra 1 skill deficiencies.

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

Geometry, 10th grade students. The pass rate decreased 26% to 45%, which is 2% lower than the state average of 47%. Contributing factors include proper placement for student commensurate with their academic skill level and past Algebra 1 EOC and Math FSA test scores. Students who have testing data that shows lower math academic skills should have been placed in math courses more aligned with their abilities in order to provide additional learning gains prior to taking Geometry. There was also a significant increase in advanced math students earning Algebra 1 credit in 8th grade and then enrolling in Geometry for 9th grade, which means the 10th grade Geometry students are trending towards the majority being non-advanced students.

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.

Geometry: The overall passing rate decreased 10% to 59% which is 2% higher than the state. Geometry: The largest group of testers is 10th grade. The pass rate decreased 26% to 45%. This is 2% lower than the state average of 47%. Contributing factors include proper placement for student commensurate with their academic skill level and past Algebra 1 EOC and Math FSA test scores. Students who have testing data that shows lower math academic skills should have been placed in math courses more aligned with their abilities in order to provide additional learning gains prior to taking Geometry. There was also a significant increase in advanced math students earning Algebra 1 credit in 8th grade and then enrolling in Geometry for 9th grade, which means the 10th grade Geometry students are trending towards the majority being non-advanced students.

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

The 12th grade ELA re-takes passing rate increased by 27%, which is 41% higher than the state passing rate. The new actions included looping 11th grade English 3 students with the same English Instructor for 12th grade English 4. The same English instructor was able to administer a reading/ELA

diagnostic instrument that allowed the teacher and reading intervention instructor to target specific skill gaps and standards to support students. Students participated in small group instruction and were provided with scaffolded resources to further support independent work. The reading intervention instructor concentrated support towards skill gaps while the content instructor focused on aligning gaps with current English 3 and 4 standards.

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

This is not applicable to the high school.

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

1. Increasing student achievement for Students with Disabilities subgroup as measured by the Federal Index.
Current federal index of 40% is 1% below the required 41% mark.

2. Increasing student achievement in ELA with a focus on 11th grade re-takers. The 11th grade passing rate
decreased by 9%. The 11th grade passing rate (49%) is 32% higher than the state passing rate (17%).
There were 140 students who tested.

3. Increasing the overall passing rate in Algebra 1. The passing rate decreased 6% to 64% in 2018-2019.
FLVS FT is 3% higher than the state level of 61%.

4. Increasing the re-taker passing rate in Algebra 1. The re-taker passing rate was 36% which is 2% higher
than the state passing rate of 34%.

5. Increasing the passing rate for 10th grade students in Geometry. The largest group of testers is 10th grade.
The pass rate decreased 26% to 45%. This is 2% lower than the state average of 47%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Students in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities missed the federal mark requirements by 1% on the Federal Percent of Points Index (ESSA) for the 2018-2019 school year.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Student performance for the Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase at least 2% on the Federal Percent of Points Index (ESSA) in the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wil Simpson (wsimpson@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	ESE Case Managers, ESE Teachers, Classroom Teachers, MTSS tiered instruction to meet students' individual needs based on accommodations as written on students IEPs: Here are some strategies that special education teachers can use to benefit all of their students: -Form small groups -Create classroom centers -Blend 'the Basics' with more specialized instruction -Rotate lessons -Try thematic instruction -Provide different levels of books and materials
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence-Based Practice in Special Education. Students with disabilities need to receive effective, scientifically-based instruction to help them reach their potential. IDEA requires special educators to use sound research in selecting methods and strategies to use in their classrooms.

Action Step	
Description	1. ESE subgroup students are identified 2. Regular meetings occur with ESE teachers and regular education teachers 3. Apply evidence based strategies in live lessons 4. Monitor student progress 5. Adjust evidence based strategies based on students' achievements
Person Responsible	Wil Simpson (wsimpson@flvs.net)

#2	
Title	Student Achievement on Geometry EOC Exam
Rationale	The overall passing rate in Geometry decreased 10% to 59% which is 2% higher than the state. The largest group of testers is 10th grade and for that group the passing rate decreased 26% to 45%. This is 2% lower than the state average of 47%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The overall student performance on the Geometry EOC exam will increase by at least 2% for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Wil Simpson (wsimpson@flvs.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	MTSS support personnel work directly with Geometry teachers to provide professional development, support strategies, and scaffolds for struggling learners with the Geometry content such as guided notes, easily accessible quick videos, and individualized pace plans. Geometry teachers provide Tier 2 intervention time weekly for struggling students Teachers provide sessions for EOC test-taking strategies to support students with format and practice in high stakes assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence-based practice in mathematics. Students performing below proficiency on prior mathematics assessments need to receive effective, scientifically-based instruction to help them reach proficiency on the Geometry EOC. Educators must use sound research in selecting methods and strategies to use in their classrooms.
Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students below proficiency on prior math assessments (Alg 1 or prior Geometry EOC). 2. Schedule and conduct professional development for Geometry teachers with MTSS support personnel. 3. Monitor student progress weekly. 4. Monthly meetings with the Student Success Team (SST) to collaborate, monitor, and adjust interventions to support students and ensure their success. 5. Teachers schedule and conduct Tier 2 intervention and test-taking sessions for identified students.
Person Responsible	Wil Simpson (wsimpson@flvs.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).

Remaining school-wide improvement priorities will focus on instruction in other areas tested by state assessment and will include professional development in state standards, test prep, and state-provided resources. The Student Success Team will focus efforts on students in Algebra 1 and ELA courses, and will provide additional support and resources for those teachers and students. Students identified as a Level 1 or Level 2 student in math and/or ELA will be placed with a smaller group of students and an

MTSS teacher so that the focus can be on individual student needs. Level 1 and Level 2 students that have already taken Algebra 1 will be placed with an MTSS teacher in LAM1 with a focus on improving Algebra 1 skills and preparation to retake the Algebra 1 EOC exam.

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: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Student Achievement on Geometry EOC Exam**	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00