

Manatee County Public Schools

Horizons Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Horizons Academy

1910 27TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

Demographics

Principal: James H IR D

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Horizons Academy

1910 27TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

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 Horizons Academy is to get our students back on track and progressing toward graduation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Horizons Academy is to be a nationally recognized alternative program.

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
Hird, James	Principal	
Clarke, Ryan	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/1/2016, James H IR D

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

2

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	2	2	11	8	14	52	35	48	45	217	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	32	15	23	11	91	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	18	10	12	3	53	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	18	7	9	12	57	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	8	23	11	16	17	86	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	23	27	36	105	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	10	60	21	11	12	127	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	41	19	15	11	100

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
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 9/2/2020

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	2	2	11	8	14	52	35	48	45	130	347	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	32	15	23	11	16	107	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	18	10	12	3	15	68	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	23	27	36	109	214	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	10	60	21	11	12	43	170	

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	3	5	6	41	19	15	11	15	115	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	2	11	8	14	52	35	48	45	130	347
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	32	15	23	11	16	107
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	18	10	12	3	15	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	11	23	27	36	109	214
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	10	60	21	11	12	43	170

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	3	5	6	41	19	15	11	15	115

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0%	58%	61%	0%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	57%	59%	0%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	54%	0%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	64%	62%	0%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	55%	52%	0%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	54%	56%	0%	48%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	83%	78%	0%	76%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	51%	-51%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	17%	56%	-39%	58%	-41%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	0%	52%	-52%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	14%	52%	-38%	54%	-40%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
07	2019	15%	48%	-33%	52%	-37%
	2018	15%	48%	-33%	51%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	12%	54%	-42%	56%	-44%
	2018	21%	55%	-34%	58%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
09	2019	8%	53%	-45%	55%	-47%
	2018	13%	52%	-39%	53%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
10	2019	6%	49%	-43%	53%	-47%
	2018	7%	52%	-45%	53%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	18%	65%	-47%	64%	-46%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	7%	57%	-50%	55%	-48%
	2018	10%	52%	-42%	52%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	12%	57%	-45%	54%	-42%
	2018	20%	54%	-34%	54%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	13%	41%	-28%	46%	-33%
	2018	13%	41%	-28%	45%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	48%	-48%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	12%	45%	-33%	48%	-36%
	2018	8%	45%	-37%	50%	-42%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	69%	-30%	67%	-28%
2018	24%	72%	-48%	65%	-41%
Compare		15%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	29%	77%	-48%	71%	-42%
2018	22%	78%	-56%	71%	-49%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	71%	-48%	70%	-47%
2018	33%	71%	-38%	68%	-35%
Compare		-10%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	6%	65%	-59%	61%	-55%
2018	12%	65%	-53%	62%	-50%
Compare		-6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	61%	-47%	57%	-43%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		14%			

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										30	
ELL										50	
BLK										17	
HSP										40	15
WHT										34	47
FRL		10								34	12
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	14
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	85
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	79%
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	50
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	9
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	28
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	41
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	14
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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.

African American students (9%) was the lowest performing subgroup, followed closely by Economically disadvantaged students (14%). The main contributing factor may be that students are reassigned to us at various intervals through the school year. Many of these students have already been struggling with school attendance and engagement. A percentage of our overall population have multiple risk factors that result in their traditional school struggles and that ultimately contribute to their reassignment.

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

African American students (9%) was the lowest performing subgroup, followed closely by Economically disadvantaged students (14%). The main contributing factor may be that students are reassigned to us at various intervals through the school year. Many of these students have already been struggling with school attendance and engagement. A percentage of our overall population have multiple risk factors that result in their traditional school struggles and that ultimately contribute to their reassignment. All subgroups struggle with attendance, which is often impacted by discipline resulting in high rates of out of school suspension.

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.

African American students had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. One factor may be that African American students seem to be reassigned to us at a significantly higher rate than other sub groups of students. Most subgroups struggle with attendance.

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

There was a significant increase/improvement in the number of and percentage of students graduating this year. Our graduation rate increased from 39% to 44 %, according to district graduation rate data. We were able to positively impact the number of students graduating by extending the time and support provided by a number of teachers. We expanded the amount of funding for teachers to work with students. This was an anomaly as we exceeded our budgeted amount of funds. The additional time for work and support proved helpful. Students were also exempted from portions of State Assessments, which appears to have motivated students to work more. Students with Disabilities did perform better than other subgroups. This may be due to the strength of our social emotional, mental health and interventions. We have also developed some options that allow us to minimize out of school suspensions for students with disabilities. Our system is designed to provide interventions for all students but they seem to be more receptive to responsive to these interventions.

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

Attendance remains one of our main concerns. Another area of concern is providing interventions that address students social emotional needs.

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

1. Increase standards based instruction across all content to thereby increase graduation rate.
2. Addressing attendance through alternative disciplinary interventions and thereby increase percentage tested.
3. Provision of social emotional and mental health interventions
- 4.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus	Based on 2018-2019 data our subgroups performed significantly lower with regard to learning gains and achievement. Our achievement and learning gains were lower than previous years.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	<p>We expect increases in achievement across sub groups as follows:</p> <p>African American 9% to 18%</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged 14% to 20%</p> <p>SWD 30% to 35%</p> <p>ELL 28% to 35%</p> <p>Increase graduation rate from 33% to 43%</p> <p>Increase testing percentage from 79% to 90%</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Hird (hirdj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Teachers will collaborate with grade level planning during Teacher Collaborative Team meetings weekly for standards based lesson planning.</p> <p>Testing Administrator will use INDIV data to target students included in testing percentage for attendance and remediation. Use PBIS rewards system to add incentive to attendance and participation in remediation.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data shows that our students are not accessing instruction that effectively prepares them to handle standards based assessments. Student grades, and progress in Reading plus and iReady, as appropriate, will be monitored. Additional data monitored includes attendance FTE Survey data to help identify students included in testing percentage

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based instructional lessons developed in Teacher Collaborative Teams. (Lesson Study)
2. Department chair collect and monitor standards based lesson plans.
3. Targeted students selected for credit recovery and course makeup using remediation funds.
4. Attendance monitored for all students. Students with less than 70% attendance targeted for credit recovery and course make up.
5. Students targeted for mental health intervention and support based on attendance, discipline and grades.

Person Responsible James Hird (hirdj@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Graduation Rate is addressed above.

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.

Horizons Academy has several opportunities to promote parent involvement. Communication between school and home is completed through the use newsletters, school website, letters, phone calls, progress reports and connect-ed messaging. Events such as back to school night(s), open house, conference night(s), award ceremony, PBS celebrations, home visitations, field trips, intake meetings, conferences and breakfast, lunch or dinner with the student are used to create welcomed environment for parents and families. The Principal uses off campus lunch and dinner events to improve community and family relations. A revised Level system, based on points monitored through PBIS rewards will provide additional data around which positive parent communication will be built.

Due to COVID19 protocols additional parent/student engagement measures have been implemented.

These included:

Student calling tree-specific staff members assigned students for routine phone call check ins.

Student Helpline-dedicated phone line and hours established for students to call for support.

Engagement of Community Resources-Home visits by PAL Liaison and Replay staff w/parent permission.

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: Graduation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00