

Manatee County Public Schools

Buffalo Creek Middle 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	18

Buffalo Creek Middle School

7320 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/buffalocreek>

Demographics

Principal: Bradley Scarborough

Start Date for this Principal: 1/20/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	48%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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 Manatee 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	18

Buffalo Creek Middle School

7320 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/buffalocreek>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	42%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

The mission of Buffalo Creek Middle School is to inspire our students with a passion for learning, empowered to pursue their dreams confidently and creatively while contributing to our community, nation and world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Buffalo Creek Middle School's vision is to establish and support standards of excellence that prepare students to become successful, well-rounded and involved citizens in the 21st Century.

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
Scarborough, Brad	Principal	The school leadership team makes up our ILT (Instructional Leadership Team). The ILT guides the school for T1 academic, behavior, and attendance problem solving. The ILT meets monthly to review data, consider needs, and take preventive or responsive action. Leadership team members are also facilitators of department meetings, PTO/SAC meetings, MTSS meetings, and grade level TCT (teacher collaboration team) meetings. Stakeholders and staff are communicating at these meetings to problem solve and improve BCMS.
Baker, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Durst, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	
Servoss, Fay	Teacher, K-12	
Rainwater, Carrie	Assistant Principal	
Cooper, Kimone	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 1/20/2019, Bradley Scarborough

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.*

2

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.*

21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

70

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	48%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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	394	415	451	0	0	0	0	1260
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	63	76	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	65	51	0	0	0	0	139
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	25	0	0	0	0	0	59
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	9	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	98	76	0	0	0	0	260

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	12	22	21	0	0	0	0	55

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	28	0	0	0	0	28
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

Monday 8/31/2020

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	439	500	417	0	0	0	0	1356	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	58	60	0	0	0	0	167	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	53	36	0	0	0	0	118	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	44	9	0	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	118	106	0	0	0	0	303	

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	29	53	36	0	0	0	0	118	

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	9	0	0	0	0	9	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	439	500	417	0	0	0	0	1356	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	58	60	0	0	0	0	167	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	53	36	0	0	0	0	118	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	44	9	0	0	0	0	73	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	118	106	0	0	0	0	303	

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	29	53	36	0	0	0	0	118

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	9	0	0	0	0	9	
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	48%	52%	54%	48%	47%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	54%	51%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	51%	47%	41%	44%	44%
Math Achievement	60%	59%	58%	61%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	61%	57%	61%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	54%	51%	45%	50%	50%
Science Achievement	38%	47%	51%	45%	39%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	77%	77%	72%	65%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019	48%	52%	-4%	54%	-6%
	2018	47%	47%	0%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	45%	48%	-3%	52%	-7%
	2018	45%	48%	-3%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	45%	54%	-9%	56%	-11%
	2018	55%	55%	0%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	58%	57%	1%	55%	3%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	57%	1%	54%	4%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	28%	41%	-13%	46%	-18%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	45%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	36%	45%	-9%	48%	-12%
	2018	47%	45%	2%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	77%	-2%	71%	4%
2018	93%	78%	15%	71%	22%
Compare		-18%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	65%	20%	61%	24%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	90%	65%	25%	62%	28%
Compare		-5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	57%	-57%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		-100%			

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	11	31	31	19	47	52	12	37			
ELL	17	43	45	30	39	41	5	45			
ASN	72	71		80	71			100			
BLK	27	42	43	37	49	42	25	75	70		
HSP	31	43	45	43	47	50	19	63	54		
MUL	43	38	17	50	62	58	18				
WHT	61	55	50	73	66	56	51	84	80		
FRL	31	43	43	44	48	50	23	66	61		
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	11	37	40	22	43	44	12		45		
ELL	10	47	42	29	52	57	11		30		
ASN	86	71		91	81						
BLK	35	46	44	43	55	51	33		70		
HSP	32	50	43	46	59	58	29	84	60		
MUL	65	63		65	47						
WHT	61	57	42	75	70	57	59	94	69		
FRL	37	49	42	50	61	56	31	87	58		
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	39	38	19	41	36	12	33			
ELL	9	35	38	30	44	44	8	35			
ASN	80	77		100	69						
BLK	31	39	37	43	55	44	28	48	45		
HSP	31	44	38	48	54	41	30	51	31		
MUL	56	58		67	65		46				
WHT	62	58	47	73	67	52	62	75	54		

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
FRL	31	43	38	49	54	43	29	53	29		

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	56
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

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	36
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	79
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	46
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	45
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	41
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	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	47
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.

Eighth grade Science data showed the most significant drop and the lowest performance from the previous year, with achievement dropping from 47% to 38%. Contributing factors regarding the decrease in student performance can be attributed to science faculty staff turnover. Also, during the

17-18 school year, the school increased the focus on incorporating text structures and explicitly teaching text structure in the science classrooms..

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

The 8th grade declined significantly in both ELA and Math achievement from the prior year. 8th grade Math achievement scores dropped by 13%. However, all grade level students did make gains in the ELA L25 arena.

BCMS students are still scoring below the required Federal Index of 41% in both ELL and ESE subgroups. ESE student scores have been low for the past two consecutive years.

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.

We have not met federal index with our SWD population for 2 consecutive years.

The factor that contributes to this gap could be the academic level of the students when they enter the middle school arena. The students are very low academically. Middle school teachers do not teach phonics or phonemic awareness. Middle school students are expected to enter middle school with reading skills and to utilize those skills to read to learn.

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

BCMS experienced an increase in ELA achievement for ELL overall. We showed an increase in our ELA Learning Gains with our lowest quartile. We also showed an increase in our Acceleration Bucket.

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

Reducing lost instructional time for the L/25 students due to discipline referrals. Helping our L25 students close that gap, by increasing rigor in our daily instruction.

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

1. Focus on standards-based instruction and alignment with curriculum road maps.
2. Additional focus and support in science instruction emphasizing reading strategies with all grade levels.
3. Increase engagement for our e-Learning and Hybrid students through the implementation of virtual tutoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our science proficiency lags behind the district average; and our ELA target proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: At the conclusion of our current year, 45% of students will score proficient on the 8th grade science SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brad Scarbrough (scarbrob@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Targeted remediation through i-EXCEL; targeting students who are proficient in ELA, while not proficient in 8th grade Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tracking students through Benchmark results; not meeting proficiency in Science while meeting proficiency in

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative data chats with 8th grade students.

Tracking BM data to identify target students.

An emphasis on vocabulary at all grade levels.

The incorporation of virtual tutoring to support e-Learning and Hybrid students.

Person Responsible Brad Scarbrough (scarbrob@manateeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase Standards based Instruction Across all Content Areas. Based on previous data ; Our ELL and SWD subgroups demonstrate lower achievement and learning gains than their counterparts.

Measurable Outcome: We will see an increase across all sub-groups as follows:
SWD-8th from 30% to 40%
ELL- Math-LG-from 39% to 52%
ELL-ELA LG- from 43% to 47%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carrie Rainwater (rainwatc@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning sessions and access to common planning time that allows for additional PD as it relates to engagement strategies that enhance student participation and comprehension.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our data indicates a lack of instruction at or above grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide additional supports through virtual tutoring; and algebra boot-camp that will be offered virtually as well.

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.

- **Increased focus on the standards and alignment with the curriculum road maps**
- **Increase the use of tiered interventions for ESE and ELL students.**
- **Add Critical Thinking classes to our Language Arts offerings with additional supports for ELL students.**
- **Add additional periods of ESE push-in support for core courses.**

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.

BCMS has a SAC and Parent Volunteer Group where school, family, and community members converge to support the school's mission and vision. BCMS holds up to six SAC meetings per year. The School Improvement Plan (SIP) is reviewed and monitored annually and SAC members participate in the approval of the SIP. A website is maintained to inform all stakeholders of upcoming events and important information. A site Facebook page is updated and maintained by a staff member. BCMS produces a quarterly school newsletter and both posts the newsletter online and provides it in print. School-wide lesson plans are submitted through Schoology to provide parents with daily homework, classroom assignments, and expectations. A FOCUS system is offered by the district, and every parent and students to access assessment scores, student grades and classwork progress. Teachers, guidance counselors, deans, the ELL Liaison, the ESE Specialist, and Administrators call parents, providing information of student successes and challenges. We communicate on students' progress, provide support opportunities and give information on events and specific needs. Multiple events are offered to provide parents and community members the opportunity to visit our school and we consistently work to build and maintain relationships with both family and community members.

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: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00

Total:		\$0.00
--------	--	--------