Umatilla High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Umatilla High School

320 N TROWELL AVE, Umatilla, FL 32784

https://uhs.lake.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Brent Frazier

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2018

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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 was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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

Umatilla High School

320 N TROWELL AVE, Umatilla, FL 32784

https://uhs.lake.k12.fl.us

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	Yes	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Lake County School Board on 10/26/2020.

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.

The mission of Umatilla High is to create a student centered experience by embracing high expectations, setting personal goals, using captivating and versatile curriculum within a collaborative community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision statement is "Inspiring for a World yet IMAGINED."

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
Gerds, Thomas	Principal	The Leadership team meets monthly to discuss overall school procedures, policies, and expectations of current events throughout the school.
Hepp, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Oversees the English department, Title I and facility usage.
Crangle, Lisa	Other	Ms. Crangle is our school's Literacy Coach and helps with our AICE program, new teacher mentor program, and MTSS.
Campbell, Donna	Other	Ms. Campbell is our graduation resource facilitator helping progress monitor students advancement towards graduation.
Royal, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Royal is the English Department Head
Archer, Rachel	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Archer oversees our ESE department making sure that all students accommodations are delivered appropriately.
Pyatt, Andrea	Assistant Principal	Ms. Pyatt is our AP that oversees the guidance department, master schedule and curriculum.
Brunson, Deta	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Brunson is the Athletic Director and Electives department head.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/2/2018, Brent Frazier

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.*

5

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
2019-20 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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (45%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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](#).	

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	195	168	162	132	657
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	39	33	62	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	17	9	9	57
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	42	38	5	134
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	42	37	4	132
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	45	42	31	167
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	96	91	58	269

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	157	162	128	137	584

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	3	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	3	10

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 8/24/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	219	225	186	166	796
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
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	55	46	50	29	180

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	99	111	87	92	389

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	42	32	30	24	128
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	22

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	219	225	186	166	796
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
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	55	46	50	29	180

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	99	111	87	92	389

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	42	32	30	24	128
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	22

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	42%	50%	56%	31%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	46%	51%	33%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	33%	42%	28%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	27%	44%	51%	36%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	28%	45%	48%	37%	41%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%	36%	45%	38%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	49%	68%	68%	41%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	59%	69%	73%	59%	69%	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	43%	47%	-4%	55%	-12%
	2018	32%	46%	-14%	53%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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
2019	49%	66%	-17%	67%	-18%
2018	53%	61%	-8%	65%	-12%
Compare		-4%			

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	60%	67%	-7%	70%	-10%
2018	59%	69%	-10%	68%	-9%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	20%	52%	-32%	61%	-41%
2018	15%	62%	-47%	62%	-47%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	28%	49%	-21%	57%	-29%
2018	40%	50%	-10%	56%	-16%
Compare		-12%			

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	16	33	32	13	26	31	25	35		84	24
HSP	42	39	25	31	16		60	72		88	50
WHT	41	44	30	26	29	30	48	58		83	63
FRL	36	39	22	22	23	28	40	51		81	42

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	19	42	33	13	31	36	38	55		87	25
BLK	7	29		15	9						
HSP	31	52	62	26	11			55		82	56
WHT	38	48	43	28	26	28	61	64		88	65
FRL	32	47	44	24	20	23	55	56		86	53

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	8	23	20	11	25	18	14	37		63	7
BLK	36	18		40	60						
HSP	20	20		31	28		45	57		82	
WHT	33	36	33	38	39	40	41	58		87	61
FRL	29	31	26	31	32	30	36	59		84	50

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	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	45
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Our lowest data component was Algebra I. We did increase proficiency by 5 percent the prior year. Algebra I from a historical perspective has been a low proficiency rate. Contributing factors to the low performance were low overall math numbers entering the 9th grade and teacher turnover throughout the school year. I also believe that the late testing window being so close to graduation played a role in student apathy towards testing. Average daily attendance is also a contributing factor.

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

The data component that showed the largest decline was Geometry. A contributing factor to this decline was 1st semester teacher turnove and a first year teacher taking over a large portion of our geometry courses. We also had a much larger cohort of testers due to a course progression change at the school level. Attendance rates are also a contributing factor.

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.

Our overall math proficiency held a 24 point gap from the state average. Contributing factors are listed in part a and b above.

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

9th grade English showed the most improvement last year. The main reason that this area has steadily improved is teacher continuity and their familiarity with a rigorous, standards aligned, grade level appropriate curriculum instructed with fidelity.

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

The two areas of EWS that are the most concern would be attendance and the number of students with multiple EWS concerns.

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

1. Math overall proficiency
2. English LQ and learning gains
3. Math LQ and learning gains
4. Attendance
5. Overall English proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the needs assessment/analysis data, academic achievement of our students with disabilities and students who are economically disadvantaged. This area of focus was identified based on the needs assessment/analysis data along with school accountability data from state testing. Students with disabilities and students who are economically disadvantaged at our school are performing below 41% proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome that we anticipate to see would be a 3% gain in all scoring categories.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Thomas Gerds (gerdst@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will develop and implement a school-wide professional development program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we develop and implement an internal school-wide professional learning program we will provide standards based and highly rigorous instruction that will increase overall student proficiency in literacy.

Action Steps to Implement

Who: Administration, Literacy Coach, Math Coach, Teacher Leaders, and district personnel.
Frequency: Weekly PD
When: 9/5/2020-5/22/2021
Evidence: Schedule, Agendas, PD Surveys, Sign-in Sheets, Classroom Walkthroughs

Person Responsible	Thomas Gerds (gerdst@lake.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Teacher Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Umatilla high school has had 24 new instructional personnel in the last two years. That makes up 48% of our overall instructional personnel. With this level of staff turnover it is critical that these individuals are supported and prepared to provide instruction that maximizes student learning. It will also increase teacher retention rates helping sustainability of school culture.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome that we anticipate to see would be a 3% gain in all scoring categories.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrea Pyatt (pyatta@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher mentoring program
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we develop and implement a new teacher mentoring program we will be able to ensure high expectations, build relationships, and develop collective efficacy.

Action Steps to Implement

Who: Administration, Literacy Coach and Teacher Leaders
Frequency: Monthly meetings and weekly check-ins.
When: 8/20/2020-5/22/2021
Evidence: Meeting Sign-in sheets, agendas, classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans.

Person Responsible	Lisa Crangle (cranglel@lake.k12.fl.us)

#3. Other specifically relating to Academic intervention for lower quartile students

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified based on the needs assessment/analysis data along with school accountability data from state testing. Students in our lower quartile are in need of targeted interventions to close academic gaps in order to become proficient.
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome that we anticipate to see would be a 3% increase for our lower quartile students in both Math and English scoring categories.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Hepp (heppa@lake.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Daily targeted intervention time
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If we provide integrated time for intervention during the school day we will implement targeted instruction driven by data collected from ongoing progress monitoring. Students in our lower quartile will participate in a 31 minute intervention block four days a week. This intervention block will be with an ELA or Math teacher as needed to help students close their academic gaps through individualized interventions and small group supports. We will provide data collection throughout the school year to determine progress and future lessons as well as support small group interventions with algebra nation and newsela. This year we will also use USA Test Prep for all tested courses to help prepare and provide content specific interventions with exam structured questions. Avid tutors will also help support this intervention time providing extra support to teachers during this time.

Action Steps to Implement

Action Steps:
Who: Administration, Literacy Coach, Teacher Leaders
Frequency: 4 days a week
When: 8/12/2020-5/22/2021
Evidence: U-time schedule, attendance, classroom walkthroughs, progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible	Thomas Gerds (gerdst@lake.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The two areas of EWS that are the most concern would be attendance and the number of students with multiple EWS concerns. In regards to attendance and students with multiple EWS concerns UHS has formed a guiding coalition committee. This committee is focused on equity, access and making sure that all students are successful. This committee met four times over summer to develop priority goals and an implementation plan. They will continue to meet monthly to monitor and adjust programs as necessary. We will provide incentives for students who show improved attendance and academic performance. We will also continue to provide a school wide mentor program where students who are at-risk are provided a mentor to check in on them on at a minimum once a week to monitor attendance, academics, and social emotional growth.

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.

At Umatilla High School our motto is "Be the Best U." This is our foundational language for developing and sustaining a positive school culture and environment. This motto is used throughout all stakeholder meetings and events and has become an established brand for our school. Umatilla High School welcomes parents to our school through multiple initiatives. Our SAC meetings are open to the public, held monthly and minutes are shared on the UHS website along with many other announcements. Additionally, the UHS Band Boosters and Athletic Boosters present opportunities for stakeholders to be involved in decision-making. During open house events, services that are provided to engage parents include setting up parent access to the online grading program, cohort graduation requirements, and the FAFSA presentation by the guidance department. The parent call out service is used for emergency notification along with special event bulletins. In addition, we utilize a school Twitter, Facebook, Instagram account to communicate with all stakeholders. The AICE Academy will also hold informational meetings for parents and the community to address questions about the AICE program. Guidance and teachers regularly call parents in regards to student progress. Our Parent Family Engagement Plan also provides for multiple scheduled events to meet and support families throughout the school year. Every effort is made for our parents to participate in our students with exceptionalities annual IEP process. Internally we have a guiding coalition committee that serves to embrace access and equity. This group of school leaders looks at ways to make sure that all students provided acceleration and extra curricular opportunities. The guiding coalition also looks at the daily environment created at the school and helps maintain a positive and healthy environment for all students.

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: Economically Disadvantaged	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Teacher Attendance	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Academic intervention for lower quartile students	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**