Northview High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Northview High School

4100 W HIGHWAY 4, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Michael Sherrill L   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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

Northview High School

4100 W HIGHWAY 4, Century, FL 32535

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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 establish a learning environment that respects student diversity, encourages potential in all students and staff, and facilitates productivity in our future citizens, who will contribute to our nation's welfare and the global environment in a positive manner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a school that empowers, inspires, and values students who will become responsible citizens who are capable of thinking critically, solving problems, and innovating ideas and who are committed to life-long education and individual successes.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
White, Brandy	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Mrs. White teaches DCT and DIT career tech courses and will be responsible for data collection in the area of math. She will, along with other team members, assist in data analysis as well as in developing strategies for improvement. She will also play a role in evaluating the effectiveness of the plan.
Johnson, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Johnson teaches Science, and since reading is such an integral component of science, will be responsible for data collection in the area of reading. She will, along with other team members, assist in data analysis as well as in developing strategies for improvement. She will also play a role in evaluating the effectiveness of the plan.
Carroll, Megan	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Ms. Carroll will serve as the School Improvement Chair. She will be responsible for scheduling meetings, hosting the SIP team meetings, and aid in data collection in the area of reading. Ms. Carroll, along with other team members, will assist in data analysis as well as in developing strategies for improvement. She will also play a role in evaluating the effectiveness of the plan.
Sherrill, Michael	Principal	Mr Sherrill will be responsible for making sure that SIP members, employees and students are collaborating to meet this year's goals in each focus area. He will assist in the review of data and the development of instructional strategies.
Pippins, Gerry	Assistant Principal	Mr. Pippins will assist in the collection and analysis of data, schedule quarterly data monitoring meetings with each subject area, and assist in the development and review of instructional strategies.
Robinson, Alison	Instructional Media	Mrs. Robinson, certified in ELA, will assist the ELA and Reading teachers in collecting data and implementation of Universal Design for Learning strategies.
Gurganus, Jason	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Gurganus teaches Earth/Space Science and will, along with other team members, assist in data analysis as well as in developing strategies for improvement. He will also play a role in evaluating the effectiveness of the plan.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Michael Sherrill L

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
31

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154	150	128	99	531
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	23	17	19	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	17	26	17	79
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	21	10	59
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	9	5	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	24	31	13	107
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	15	4	0	48

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	10	22	21	19	72

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	11	4	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	2	23

Date this data was collected or last updated
Thursday 8/13/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	136	121	109	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	18	24	21	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	16	12	64
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	33	27	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	44	40	35	709

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	27	30	33	29	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	3	7	9	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	2	18

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	136	121	109	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	18	24	21	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	16	16	12	64
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	33	33	27	98
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590	44	40	35	709

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	27	30	33	29	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	3	7	9	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	5	2	18

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	47%	49%	56%	52%	48%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	41%	47%	51%	44%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	33%	42%	27%	33%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	38%	42%	51%	33%	43%	49%
Math Learning Gains	34%	48%	48%	30%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	16%	41%	45%	16%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	51%	59%	68%	65%	60%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	62%	73%	66%	62%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	45%	48%	-3%	55%	-10%
	2018	54%	49%	5%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	48%	48%	0%	53%	-5%
	2018	46%	49%	-3%	53%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

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	50%	58%	-8%	67%	-17%
2018	52%	57%	-5%	65%	-13%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-2%			

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

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	62%	-12%	70%	-20%
2018	70%	65%	5%	68%	2%
Compare		-20%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	16%	52%	-36%	61%	-45%
2018	28%	51%	-23%	62%	-34%
Compare		-12%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	47%	5%	57%	-5%
2018	42%	48%	-6%	56%	-14%
Compare		10%			

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	18	19	15	19			25	7		58	
AMI	67	47									
BLK	21	25	13	5			18	24		72	69
MUL	38	42									
WHT	50	45	32	44	33	14	54	56		88	71
FRL	32	30	29	38	42		26	36		83	67
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	10	24	24	12						82	21
AMI	90										

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
BLK	19	38	38	14			21	38		82	22
MUL	55	80									
WHT	55	47	28	42	56	31	59	78		85	52
FRL	33	39	32	33	58		33	72		78	42
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	20	36	32	22			42			54	
BLK	23	33	25	19	31			37		56	57
MUL	70	60									
WHT	56	44	28	35	30	17	68	71		94	56
FRL	47	43	30	28	29	15	59	60		74	60

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	57
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile. Instructional instability is a major contributing factor. Inexperienced educators and the inability to differentiate instruction for low performers resulted in inadequate performance.

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

Social Studies Achievement has declined from a lack of standards based instruction and appropriate reading strategies.

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.

Lower Quartile Math. Our biggest factor is the instability of teachers in our math department.

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

Acceleration Points. Students who were missing a dual enrollment credit or industry certification were encouraged to attempt a certification exam. Students were provided with the opportunity to earn these certifications in various business, culinary, agriculture, and advanced manufacturing classes.

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

Our main areas of concern are our students with disabilities and black and multiracial students. Attendance remains a concern for all groups.

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

1. Algebra I achievement percentage in our black students, students with disabilities, and multi-racial groups.
learning for the lower quartile.
2. ELA achievement percentage in our black, students with disabilities and multi-racial groups.
3. Increase black sub-group LG% in math.
4. Increase multi-racial LG% in ELA.
5. Increase SWD graduation rate.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with disabilities and Black/African American students are our areas of FOCUS. These two sub-groups are identified because students in these groups achieve in math and ELA at a significantly lower percentage than our other sub-groups. Additionally, the graduation rate for SWD decreased by 24% from the 2017-18 school year to the 2018-19 school year, and the Black/African American graduation rate decreased by 10% in the same period. Eighteen point three percent (18.3%) of our students are ESE. Of this 18.3%, 19.3% are Black/African American. Meeting the needs of our ESE students will also help meet the needs of our Black/African American sub-group.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of black/African-American students scoring proficient in math will increase from 5% to at least 32% in the 2020-2021 school year. The percentage of SWD students scoring proficient on the ELA FSA will increase from 18% to at least 32% in the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Sherrill (msherrill@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement Universal Design for Learning school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Universal Design for Learning is designed to allow all students an equal opportunity to learn, regardless of disability or culture by providing varied and flexible ways to present information. The principles of UDL allow for multiple means of presentation, allow students the freedom to demonstrate what they know in different ways and engages students by allowing for varying levels of rigor. Full implementation will allow the students in our focus sub-groups to achieve at a level equal to our higher achieving groups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify teachers willing to learn about and implement UDL strategies.
2. Assess the current knowledge level of the teachers.
3. These teachers will become the UDL team.
4. Provide professional development for the UDL team to learn about UDL.
5. Identify an area of focus.
6. Analyze available data to accurately monitor progress in math and ELA classes.
7. Share results of performance with other faculty members to create faculty buy-in.

Person Responsible Michael Sherrill (msherrill@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Northview High School will increase the average daily attendance to 95% in school year 2020-21. The attendance clerk will monitor attendance and refer sudents that have attendance issues to an attendance study team. The team will meet bi-monthly to address students that have missed 10% or more of the school year to look for trends and develop interventions.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

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

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

Our goal is to Increase the opportunities for home-to-school and school-to-home communications about school programs and students' progress. A new challenge to parental communication is the Covid virus. With many students to choose to learn at home, communication with parents is even more important. Other barriers that influence parental participation are that working parent job schedules, transportation problems, and parents unaware of school goals and activities. We plan to increase parental involvement by informing parents of upcoming school activities and events through every way possible. We will use local news coverage, the school website, school messenger, FOCUS email and radio broadcasts. Announcements are placed on the school website as well. Instructional, support, and administrative staff are responsible for implementing parental improvement strategies. Monitoring will be done by parental attendance during student activities, surveys, and documentation of attendance.

Steps to improve parental communication.
1. We have created a team for school-community partnerships.
2. Training and guidelines are provided to team members.
4. The team Identifies starting points-present activities, strengths and weaknesses.
5. The team develops goals to support student achievement.
6. Using our goals as a guide, the team writes a one-year action plan for partnerships.
7. Enlist staff, parents, students, and community groups to help conduct activities.
8. Evaluate implementations and results.
9. Conduct annual celebrations and report progress to all participants.
10. Continue working toward a comprehensive, on-going, positive program of community partnerships.
11. A Google Classroom has been set up for communication with all grades 9-12. Each grade has a Classroom.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00