

Volusia County Schools

Ortona Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ortona Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/ortona/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Dyer

Start Date for this Principal: 1/6/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Volusia 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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ortona Elementary School

1265 N GRANDVIEW AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/ortona/pages/default.aspx>

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)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	86%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

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 Volusia 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.

Through the cooperation of all, our students shall acquire the knowledge, wisdom and ethics which will enable them to be successful contributors in a democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Each child will be supported to unlock or nourish their unique strengths, enabling them to acquire skills and knowledge to become successful life-long learners.

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
Dyer, Kati	Principal	
Campanella, Gina	Other	
Lyons, Debbie	Instructional Coach	
Murphy, Tiffani	Teacher, K-12	
Gheen, Audrey	Instructional Media	
Nix, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/6/2020, Kathryn Dyer

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

20

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2021-06-30
-----------------------------------	--------------------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (48%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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	23	40	42	34	40	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
Attendance below 90 percent	5	15	9	3	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
	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	3	2	1	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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	42	37	26	39	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	3	6	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	42	37	26	39	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	3	6	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	7	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	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	52%	56%	57%	50%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	48%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	46%	53%	25%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	55%	59%	63%	49%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	56%	62%	45%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	43%	51%	37%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	57%	53%	54%	59%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	46%	58%	-12%	58%	-12%
	2018	54%	56%	-2%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	60%	-6%	62%	-8%
	2018	59%	58%	1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	59%	-6%	64%	-11%
	2018	61%	60%	1%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	50%	57%	-7%	61%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	56%	-1%	53%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	42%	56%	-14%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						

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			42							
ELL	60			70							
BLK	24	35		21	44						
HSP	50			55							
WHT	64	52		67	52		83				
FRL	46	45	21	50	46	54	53				
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	29	50		29	33						
ELL	40			80							
BLK	36	20		36	65		20				
HSP	60			70							
WHT	62	56		72	54		48				
FRL	54	45	33	57	59	47	39				
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	27	36		40	55						
BLK	32	42		23	33						
HSP	47			47							
WHT	57	48	14	56	49	42	62				
FRL	46	43	20	42	42	35	45				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	341
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	65
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	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	53
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	64
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	45
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 Quartile- Contributing factors were curriculum (teachers hesitation to use modules). Intervention/ intervention teachers could benefit from PD on targeted resources and intervention strategies. Students in lowest quartile did not attend after school tutoring, nor was the tutoring program resource rich.

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

ELA Lowest Quartile dropped 20%- Contributing factors were curriculum (teachers hesitation to use modules). Intervention/ intervention teachers could benefit from PD on targeted resources and intervention strategies. Students in lowest quartile did not attend after school tutoring, nor was the tutoring program resource rich.

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.

ELA Lowest Quartile at 21% had the greatest gap compared to the state average of 53%. Contributing factors were curriculum (teachers hesitation to use modules). Intervention/ intervention teachers could benefit from PD on targeted resources and intervention strategies. Students in lowest quartile did not attend after school tutoring, nor was the tutoring program resource rich

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

Science increased from 43% proficiency to 60% proficiency, showing the most improvement. Science was an area of focus in the 2018-19 school year and will continue this year. 5th Grade teams embeds the 3rd and 4th grade standards throughout their lessons. Met with district personnel to review district data and plan lessons to connect those standards to the 5th grade standards. Review with students (Kahoots and CPALMS) on 3rd and 4th grade standards. We will continue to work on reviewing and embedding 3rd and 4th grade "Fair Game" standards throughout the year.

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

Attendance and suspensions are both areas of concern. This is why we chose these two areas to focus on as part of our SIP.

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

1. ELA
2. Referrals/ Suspensions
3. Tardy reduction
4. Math learning gains
5. Science

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA proficiency was at 52%, ELA Learning Gains was 50% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 21% which was far below the district and state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on ELA Lowest Quartile in our Lowest Quartile were also our two targeted ESSA Subgroups, ESE and Black, that performed below 41%.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA Lowest Quartile from 21% to 50%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Debbie Lyons (dlyons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher led small group instruction with standard based instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teacher led Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCCR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review lowest quartile data to finalize master schedule focused on proper interventions for ESE/ELL support.
2. Facilitate PL on core connections and preservice ELA and intervention pieces.
3. Administer I-Ready Diagnostic to establish baseline data,
4. Conduct weekly PLC's to review school base data.
5. Data chats with admin. focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions with coach.
6. Conduct weekly progress monitoring meetings with ESE, African American, and Intervention Teachers to review data and support services to plan instruction.
7. Create coaching cycles to support small group instruction (coach/ district support)
8. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative Walkthroughs and Feedback.

Person Responsible Debbie Lyons (dlyons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based off school data with high numbers of suspensions. Ortona had 30 in school suspensions and 77 out of school suspensions. This number is entirely too high, putting us in the red for the district. If you're not in the classroom you will not be learning which correlates to all academics. Time on task as a whole instead of dealing with discipline.
Measurable Outcome:	Monitor the number of student referrals and suspensions through Focus (monthly). Reduce the number of suspensions from over 100 for the year to 50.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gina Campanella (gmcampan@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS is a proactive systems approach to establishing the behavioral supports and social culture needs for all students in a school to achieve social, emotional, and academic success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of positive reinforcement keeps students in the classroom and learning instead of losing valuable academic time dealing with negative behaviors.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBI training during pre planning
2. CHAMPS
3. Schoolwide discipline procedures (consistent practices for each room)
4. Ms. Rowe (guidance) have targeted group to utilize positive relationships or time out corner
5. Teachers have a buddy teacher to use as cool down instead of writing a referral
6. Share data with teachers
7. Morning announcements sharing who is in the lead with positive points

Person Responsible Gina Campanella (gmcampan@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our focus is on student tardy. We do not want to encourage sick children to come to school, especially during this time. However, we want our healthy students to arrive on time. We have many students who are chronically late. We had 1552 unexcused absences and 509 tardy.

Measurable Outcome: Checking tardy in Focus weekly. We would like to take our 509 tardy down to 350 tardy for the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS is a proactive systems approach to establishing the behavioral supports and social culture needs for all students in a school to achieve social, emotional, and academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students need to be in school, on time or will lose a large amount of academic time. A student who misses 30 minutes a day, misses 11 hours a month/ almost two days of school a month. This strategy rewards students for attending school on time.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PBIS Training during pre-planning
2. Establish schoolwide point system for being on time (PBIS)
3. Visit from Dolphin
4. Fin-Tastic classroom for no tardies for the month
5. Connect Ed messages with updates
6. Share updates with all stakeholders
7. Morning announcements sharing who is in the lead with positive points

Person Responsible: Kati Dyer (kbdyer@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Math Learning Gains- Support from district with math block and intervention help from academic coach and intervention teacher.

Science- Focused science block in all grade levels, common experiments, and lessons to focus on fair game standards

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.

We connect with a share information through PTA and SAC. We have "Spirit Nights" through PTA in the community to build relationships and raise money for our school. PTA has free family events such as build a burger, international night, nature night, and more. Our school partners with Hard Rock, local churches, and Provision Packs to feed and clothe our students and families who are in need. We utilize our guidance and social worker to help with mental health referrals or students/ family who have a greater need that what the school can provide.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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