

Pasco County Schools

Anclore High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Anclote High School

1540 SWEETBRIAR DR, Holiday, FL 34691

<https://ahs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Vanessa Moon

Start Date for this Principal: 5/25/2018

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)	78%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 Pasco 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Anclote High School

1540 SWEETBRIAR DR, Holiday, FL 34691

<https://ahs.pasco.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	70%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	47%

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 Pasco 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.

We are a high-achieving, student focused community of learners exhibiting passion, commitment and unity. Our goal is to make a difference for our students and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Why?

Fulfill the promise of preparing students for College, Career, and Life.

What?

Provide students with a rigorous and relevant educational experience that maximizes student engagement and is founded in meaningful relationships.

How?

Focus PLCs on alignment of curriculum, best practices, and common assessments.

Provide differentiated support for intervention and remediation.

Strengthen academic, social, emotional, and behavioral readiness levels of students as 21st century learners.

Monitor progress through data analysis of key indicators.

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
Moon, Vanessa	Principal	
Caldwell, Dillard	Assistant Principal	
Feyedelem, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Lanser, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Collins, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Sparks, Erica	School Counselor	
Mizeski, Mike	Teacher, K-12	
Anderson, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Anges, Kali	Assistant Principal	
	Assistant Principal	James Smith
Smith, James	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 5/25/2018, Vanessa Moon

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

61

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)	78%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	0	312	327	241	880
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	48	33	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	71	35	169
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
courses failures ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	91	56	244
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	118	87	295

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	94	96	61	251

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

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	0	317	345	249	285	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	54	28	63	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	84	56	48	255
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	127	80	84	348
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	123	83	68	397

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	80	118	77	80	355

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	317	345	249	285	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	54	28	63	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	84	56	48	255
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	127	80	84	348
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	123	83	68	397

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	80	118	77	80	355

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	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	47%	57%	56%	41%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	53%	51%	46%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	41%	42%	40%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	45%	56%	51%	41%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	49%	48%	46%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	42%	45%	33%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	70%	68%	56%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	73%	73%	67%	68%	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	47%	57%	-10%	55%	-8%
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	53%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

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	59%	68%	-9%	67%	-8%
2018	51%	65%	-14%	65%	-14%
Compare		8%			

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	65%	69%	-4%	70%	-5%
2018	56%	70%	-14%	68%	-12%
Compare		9%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	60%	-19%	61%	-20%
2018	30%	63%	-33%	62%	-32%
Compare		11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	50%	62%	-12%	57%	-7%
2018	53%	60%	-7%	56%	-3%
Compare		-3%			

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	13	27	21	16	35	31	24	44		65	21
ELL	19	46	39	31	39	27	26			71	40
ASN	60	79		83	64		55				
BLK	23	32	40	24	59	42	41	58		91	10

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
HSP	43	42	29	43	51	38	54	67		80	18
MUL	45	47		46	47		48	79		77	40
WHT	51	52	41	48	58	53	66	68		84	42
FRL	42	48	37	44	56	51	57	66		82	34
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	13	22	13	20	64		21	49		59	12
ELL	11	31		32				18		73	
ASN	62	67		80							
BLK	18	34	27	7	20	27	21	46		71	24
HSP	42	52	34	40	52	29	53	43		73	33
MUL	49	51		48	58		58	58		69	
WHT	46	44	20	47	53	36	54	64		79	37
FRL	40	45	26	39	52	34	47	55		73	33
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	11	35	26	16	35	26	28	27		71	13
ELL	13	25	23	27	40		20				
BLK	35	41	39	19	27	15	41	53		71	27
HSP	35	35	29	39	51	35	39	54		76	59
MUL	42	62		50	37		67	57		82	
WHT	44	49	42	43	47	38	62	72		74	38
FRL	38	45	40	37	44	34	53	63		71	37

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	52
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	575
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	68
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	42
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
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	51
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.

ELA Lowest 25% (ELL and ESE Students)
Missing foundational skills, attendance
Lack of Tier III supports school wide in grades 9&10

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

We did not have a decline in any area except to the area of math. This is only when we include students who took the test who are not enrolled in the course. We also know that we tested the 12th graders in Geometry last year in December, which affected their performance. We will be phasing out seniors taking Geometry in 12th grade.

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.

ELL and Science performance. A major barrier was the lack of teachers in these areas. We were missing out ESOL support for about a year. We also had high turn over and permanent substitutes in the science department.

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

Lowest 25% performance increased. Our school put in some deliberate monitoring systems that began with the teachers identifying their own students. We began working on implementing Tier II and III interventions for students and increased the frequency of our problem solving/MTSS meetings. We also focused on school wide writing strategies.

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

9th grade discipline
12th grade attendance

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

1. 1. ESE
2. ELL
3. ELA Achievement (Lowest 25%)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus	ESE Performance
Description and Rationale:	Our ESE students are performing below the ESSA threshold at 30%.
Measurable Outcome:	Our goal is to increase the performance of ESE students to 41% as measured by the FSA as well as to increase their participation and success in acceleration opportunities.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dillard Caldwell (dycaldwe@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Identify ESE students for Tier II and III interventions
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	CFA Writing Assessments Quarterly Check Data (NWEA)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for VE teachers to monitor various assessments for their students in regards to CFA, Quarterly Checks and writing assessments.
2. Train teachers in the area of the FSA Writing Rubric
3. ESE PLC will monitor student performance and create Tier II and III interventions for their students .
4. Obtain district support to increase the efficiency of ESE paperwork completion so that student contact time may be increased.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: ELL Student Performance
 Our ELL students performed below the ESSA threshold at 39%.

Measurable Outcome: Our ELL student performance measures from FSA will increase from 39% to 43% this school year. We will also increase the graduation rate of our ELL students by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Smith (jtsmith@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Maintain a highly qualified ESOL IA for a full year.
 Provide PD to teachers for best practices for ELL students.
 Provide specific school counseling services for ELL students.
 Have an intensive reading class specifically for ESOL students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We have not had a full year of services in the past two years. We need consistency to help these students.
 Teachers will be best prepared to serve ELL students when they have been properly trained and armed with strategies. Close monitoring of the ELL students progress towards graduation will help us to intervene earlier.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will participate in Culturally Relevant Teaching and Trauma Informed Care.
 We will retain our current ESOL IA.
 Identify a personnel to monitor the grade rate among ELL students. SSAP?

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Lowest 25% Performance Our students in ELA showed the greatest deficit from the state average this past school year with 47% and 42% in 9th and 10th grade, respectively.
Measurable Outcome:	Our current grade 10 students will achieve a 5% increase in performance this year to 53%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kali Anges (kanges@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	School Wide Writing (FSA Rubric) Rigorous Grade Level instruction (IPG) Monitor the Lowest 25% (MTSS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Improving writing across the school will increase student achievement in ELA FSA. Providing students access to grade level instruction at the rigor of the standard will increase student achievement. Monitoring the lowest 25% will allow for tiered interventions to occur.

Action Steps to Implement

- Develop writing CFAs and calibrate teachers
- Implement a school wide monitoring system for writing data by student.
- Monitor instruction using the IPG tool quarterly.
- Writing workshops for the 10th grade ELA students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA.

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.

Involve an adequate representation of parents, or establish a parent advisory board to represent families, in developing and evaluating the "School Parent and Family Engagement Plan" that describes how the school will carry out its required family engagement activities.

Hold an annual meeting for families to explain the Title I program and the rights of parents to be involved. Offer other meetings/workshops at flexible times.

Use a portion of Title I funds to support parent and family engagement and involve parents in deciding how these funds are to be used.

Involve parents in the planning, review, and improvement of the Title I program.

Develop a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, students, and school staff will share the responsibility for improving student achievement, and describes how parents and teachers will communicate.

Offer assistance to parents in understanding the education system and the state standards, and how to support their children's achievement.

Provide materials and training to help parents support their child's learning at home. Educate teachers and other school staff, including school leaders, on how to engage families effectively.

Coordinate with other federal and state programs, including preschool programs. Provide information in a format and language parents can understand, and offer information in other languages as feasible.

Our Parent Involvement Coordinator will work to build community partnerships with our school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.