

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Hive Preparatory 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	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.hiveprep.org

Demographics

Principal: Carlos Gonzalez

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2009

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	7%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

N/A

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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Hive Preparatory School

5855 NW 171ST ST, Hialeah, FL 33015

www.hiveprep.org

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 KG-8	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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 HIVE Preparatory School is to collaborate with stakeholders in creating a Highly Inquisitive Versatile Education that will facilitate a student-centered, adaptable learning environment. The School will provide students with a rigorous academic and social preparation that will promote dignity, courtesy, discipline, responsibility, and high expectations in order to achieve high academic standards and become productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

HIVE Preparatory School establishes the following goals in achieving its vision:

- 1.Create a safe, nurturing academic environment where all students will achieve high academic standards and professionals are empowered to embrace accountability.
- 2.Ensure students are exposed to a broad swath of cultural and academic experiences as preparation for success in a global economy.
- 3.Furnish adequate resources to achieve the School's mission including the recruitment and retention of highly qualified teachers and motivated staff.
- 4.Deliver an instructional system that will be tailored to individual learning styles including; differentiated instructions, active learning, and learning centers.
- 5.Serve students with disabilities according to their IEP.
- 6.Provide a flexible and versatile approach that will ensure continuous improvement of all learners.
- 7.Maintain an effective level of parental involvement.

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
Gonzalez, Carlos	Principal	Contribute to the school improvement process with an emphasis on math and science.
Zequeira, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Contribute to the school improvement process with an emphasis on ELA.
Bonilla, Sergio	Assistant Principal	Contribute to the school improvement process with an emphasis on ESOL and middle school.
Gonzalez, Alejandra	Teacher, ESE	Contribute to the school improvement plan process with an emphasis on special education.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/10/2009, Carlos Gonzalez

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.*

36

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	7%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (65%)
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	N/A
* 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	118	133	143	80	69	66	92	77	63	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	1	2	2	0	1	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	1	8	0	3	17	14	12	10	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	2	11	0	3	8	9	11	8	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	1	6	0	3	7	5	7	5	0	0	0	0	35

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	4	10	2	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	135	144	92	74	67	96	79	65	85	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	6	1	0	2	4	3	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	5	5	4	2	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
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	135	144	92	74	67	96	79	65	85	0	0	0	0	837
Attendance below 90 percent	6	1	0	2	4	3	1	4	6	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	5	5	5	4	2	2	10	10	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	5	5	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	29

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
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	81%	63%	61%	76%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	72%	61%	59%	71%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	57%	54%	63%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	88%	67%	62%	82%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	81%	63%	59%	76%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%	56%	52%	59%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	86%	56%	56%	78%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	93%	80%	78%	98%	75%	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	
	(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	72%	60%	12%	58%	14%
	2018	83%	61%	22%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
	2018	79%	60%	19%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	86%	60%	26%	56%	30%
	2018	74%	59%	15%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
06	2019	80%	58%	22%	54%	26%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
07	2019	74%	56%	18%	52%	22%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	54%	24%	51%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	93%	60%	33%	56%	37%
	2018	86%	59%	27%	58%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	67%	20%	62%	25%
	2018	79%	67%	12%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	89%	69%	20%	64%	25%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	85%	65%	20%	60%	25%
	2018	87%	66%	21%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	84%	58%	26%	55%	29%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019	92%	53%	39%	54%	38%
	2018	70%	52%	18%	54%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	72%	40%	32%	46%	26%
	2018	27%	38%	-11%	45%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		45%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	89%	53%	36%	53%	36%
	2018	81%	56%	25%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	73%	43%	30%	48%	25%
	2018	72%	44%	28%	50%	22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	68%	32%	67%	33%
2018	100%	65%	35%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	73%	19%	71%	21%
2018	95%	72%	23%	71%	24%
Compare		-3%			
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	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
2018	93%	59%	34%	62%	31%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	41	48	53	56	65	50					
ELL	78	72	61	86	84	79	83	100			
BLK	74	71	61	84	74	61	76	87			

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	83	71	61	89	83	76	88	94	83		
FRL	80	72	60	86	81	71	85	94	81		
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	21	44	43	37	56	58					
ELL	65	73	74	64	61	58		92			
BLK	78	69	75	74	60	43	88	100	90		
HSP	81	73	62	80	68	60	84	96	86		
WHT	83			50							
FRL	81	71	66	79	66	58	87	95	87		
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	22	53	58	47	50						
ELL	61	58	48	75	64	46	62				
BLK	74	63	61	80	78	42	69	100			
HSP	76	72	62	83	75	62	81	98	100		
WHT	91			64							
FRL	77	72	63	83	76	58	81	98	100		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	799
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	80
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	74
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	80
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	78
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.

SWD students scored a 41% proficiency in English Language Arts. This group of students have been identified as struggling learners and are already receiving multiple levels of support. An adjustment to the quality of support was made last year and showed an increase of 20 percentage points. However, this subgroup has consistently under performed when compared to other subgroups.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile students decreased in proficiency from 65% to 62%. Intensive reading classes were scheduled back to back which led to a "dragging" feeling, according to the classroom teachers. Keeping the kids engaged for such long times proved to be difficult.

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.

HIVE Prep outperformed the State in every category. Thus, the component that outperformed the State the least was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. As mentioned within part b, adjusting the schedules and/or the classroom structures in a way that support student engagement will be the priority.

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

Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement. Middle school intensive math was made mandatory for all students scoring a level 1 or 2 in the prior year's FSA. Elementary intervention groups placed a focus on math scores sooner than in previous years.

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

An area of concern is course failure in ELA and Math.

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

1. SWD ELA scores
2. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus are ELA scores for SWD students and the lowest 25%. This subgroup has consistently been the lowest performing group in the school. While scores improved dramatically from 2018-2019, they were still significantly lower than any other subgroup.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase ELA proficiency for the SWD subgroup by 5 percentage points, from 41% to 46%. In addition, increase the ELA Proficiency of the lowest 25% 5 percentage points as well, from 62% to 67%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Zequeira (jlzequeira@hiveprep.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Individualize the curriculum of interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Currently, interventions focus on subgroup deficiencies. This year, the school will increase the number of individuals involved in interventions so that the SWD students can receive instruction directly related to his/her needs. i-Ready intervention software will be used to determine the needs and multiple classroom resources (core, i-Ready, etc.) will be utilized to instruct.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify individual needs via i-Ready diagnostics
2. Group student according to exact deficiencies
3. Implement intervention program
4. Review student progress (bi-weekly, mid-year diagnostics)
5. Adjust as needed

Person Responsible Jennifer Zequeira (jlzequeira@hiveprep.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will maintain a close relationship with teachers to ensure that there is rigor in the classroom instruction. Grade level meetings will be held to discuss classroom data and students who may be showing areas of concern. Teachers will continue to support struggling students with interventions and small groups.

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.

See PFEP.

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: ELA				\$56,489.72
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	100-Salaries	1014 - Hive Preparatory School	Title, I Part A	841.0	\$56,489.72
			<i>Notes: A reading coach position was created to provide support to the ELA department as well as reading interventions and small groups.</i>			
Total:						\$56,489.72