Academy For Innovative Education

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Academy For Innovative Education

1080 LA BARON DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

www.aiecharterschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Vera H IR Sh

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
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 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	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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 Dade 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

Academy For Innovative Education

1080 LA BARON DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

www.aiecharterschool.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-12	No	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	94%

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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 Academy for International Education is to create student-leaders who are empowered by challenging academic experiences while solving real-world problems in a culture of innovation and collaboration. Our students think critically, discover relentlessly, and act ethically, in service of humanity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AIE will immerse its students in science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics (STEAM) as a way of seeking facts and making sense of the world around them. At AIE learning is focused on active exploration of major concepts, ideas and theories through hands-on learning and real-life problem solving. Students will be challenged to use scientific knowledge and critical thinking skills as they take ownership of their personal academic exploration and growth.

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
Fajet, Walter	Principal	Dr. Walter Fajet, Principal, provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures adequate professional development; communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities; and provides support to the teachers and staff to ensure fidelity of instructional delivery and use of grade level materials. Dr. Fajet makes sure all middle school students are scheduled appropriately in the corresponding classes based on their FSA scores and performance.
Hirsh, Vera	Other	Vera Hirsh, Head of Schools, ensures that all leadership members attend the Leadership Weekly Meetings in order to discuss school's concerns, instructional strategies, lesson plan development, parents' concerns, textbooks orders, technology, software usage, etc. Vera Hirsh makes sure that the implementation of intervention is in place. In addition, Mrs. Hirsh supports and suggests professional developments based on a needs assessment survey to increase the school-based team's knowledge of essential strategies that are vital to the implementation of RTI. She makes decisions for the use of data driven instruction which allows her to confer with parents regarding academics and activities in order to provide support and effectively inform about student achievement. Mrs. Hirsh ensures commitment and allocates resources.
Bertrand, Megan	Assistant Principal	Megan Bertrand, Vice Principal, directs the execution of the principal's vision for the use of data based decision-making, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development, and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans activities. Ms. Bertrand monitors student behaviors on Kickboard and provides appropriate interventions, such as assigning student consequence, scheduling student conferences, and communicating with parents. Ms. Bertrand investigates special cases involving the well-being and safety of students, such as threats, harassment, and bullying, and communicates accordingly with appropriate stakeholders. Ms. Bertrand ensures all teachers and staff are assigned to a morning and afternoon post to promote student's safety.
Canelo, Dorremi	School Counselor	Dorremi Canelo, Guidance Counselor, plans and implements an anti-bullying program. meets with students for individual and group counseling. The counselor implements a school wide character education program. She delivers lessons in each grade level to discuss with students about various topics dealing with behavior, character education, bullying, etc. The counselor also implements the Do the Right Thing Program (DTRT). In addition, the counselor provides support to teachers and administrators to make sure students and parents are aware of the importance of attendance. The counselor recognizes students, parents, and teachers who cooperate and participate in school's activities. The counselor assists with scheduling and makes sure all the students are scheduled in the appropriate classes based on their academic needs.
Camji, Carlos	Teacher, ESE	Carlos Camji, Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher, collaborates with general education teachers to plan activities and accommodate students' IEP' Mr. Camji assists with MTSS/RTI TIER 3 implementation and data collection. In

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		addition, he works in collaboration with teachers to monitor students' progress. Mr. Camji meets with other professionals such as Psychologists, Speech Pathologists, Social Workers, and other agencies. In order to revise, update, and evaluate student's IEP's, logs are initiated as needed.
Guiu-Garcia, Gabriela	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Gabriela Guiu-Garcia, Social Sciences Department Chair and School Data Analyst, directs the execution of the principal's vision for the use of data based decision-making. Ms. Guiu collects school-wide assessment data from district-based assessments in all subject areas. She disaggregates data and analyzes data trends, growth, and areas of improvement before sharing with teachers. In addition, she leads the social sciences department by leading department meetings and supports teachers with lesson planning, informal observations and feedback, gathering resources, and implementing research-based strategies throughout the department.
Olmedo, Eileen	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Eileen Olmedo, Instructional Coach and Language Arts Department Chair, provides instructional support for new teachers and teachers recommended by administrators. She helps teachers identify systematic patterns of student needs while working with administrators to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Additionally, she leads the language arts and reading department by leading department meetings and supports teachers with lesson planning, informal observations and feedback, gathering resources, and implementing research-based strategies throughout the department.
Curiel, Brandy	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Curiel, STEAM Liaison, SECME Coordinator, and Science Department Chair, directs the execution of the principal's vision for the integration of science and technology throughout the school. She manages the plan for district STEAM school designation and organizes preparation for the district SECME competition by meeting with administrators and teachers to develop and implement a plan for instruction, project-based learning, incorporation of technology and the engineering design process, community involvement, and school STEAM showcases. Additionally, she leads the science department by leading department meetings and supports teachers with lesson planning, informal observations and feedback, gathering resources, and implementing research-based strategies throughout the department.
Germain, Matania	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Matania Germain, ELL Support Liaison and Mathematics, participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities/materials into after-school tutoring, and collaborate with general education teachers for such activities. Additionally, she leads the mathematics department by leading department meetings and supports teachers with lesson planning, informal observations and feedback, gathering resources, and implementing research-based strategies throughout the department.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/1/2019, Vera H IR Sh

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
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 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	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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	123	123	124	62	29	0	0	461
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	2	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	22	13	5	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	29	8	2	0	0	56

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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
Monday 9/14/2020

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	120	120	99	34	0	0	0	373
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	17	2	0	0	0	48

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	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
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	120	120	99	34	0	0	0	373
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	21	17	2	0	0	0	48

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	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
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%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	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**	**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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
2018					

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					
2018					

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
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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data

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.

The 8th grade science achievement showed the lowest performance last year. Contributing factors included:
1. Fast pacing due to two factors: mandatory STEM projects and time lost due to an instructor change
2. Need for improved progress monitoring and remedial support planning

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

8th grade science achievement is the data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year, which was a 16% decrease.
In addition to the factors previously described, students needed more hands-on learning, exploration opportunities, and support in reading comprehension and analysis, specifically in the content area.

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.

8th grade science achievement is the data component that shows a gap between the state and AIE. There is a
24 percentage point gap between AIE and the State.
This is the area of greatest need specifically for factors previously described.

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

ELA Learning Gains is the component that showed most improvement.
Some actions the school took in this area are the following:
1. Providing after school tutoring
2. Implementing RTI with fidelity

3. Improving classroom instruction
4. Use of I-Ready and monitoring student's progress

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

Two potential areas of concerns are:
1. Science achievement
2. Implementation of rigorous instruction across grade levels

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

1. 8th grade science instruction improvement
2. Implementation of rigorous instruction
3. Increasing critical thinking skills
4. Data-driven instructional planning
5. Progress monitoring of students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research has shown that purposeful planning, inquiry science instruction, and contextually rich academic science vocabulary development can lead to improved student-science learning outcomes and narrowed achievement gaps. These components should be considered as areas for instructional improvement in the targeted science class to maximize student learning and produce positive outcomes for student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	As a result of instructional improvement, student achievement in 8th grade science will increase to a score of at least 45%, a 21 percentage point increase from the previous year's score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Walter Fajet (walterfajet@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Lesson planning must occur by utilizing the Understanding by Design and the 5E framework to encourage teachers to think purposefully and help focus curriculum and teaching on the development and deepening of student understanding and transfer of learning. Teachers will take an investigative approach to teaching and learning where students are provided with opportunities to investigate a problem, search for possible solutions, make observations, ask questions, test out ideas, and think creatively and use their intuition. Throughout these lessons, teachers will infuse vocabulary in student reading, writing, and discussion.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful planning with the Universal by Design (UbD) framework and 5Es model is supported by research and positive student achievement results. Research also shows that inquiry is engaging and cognitively challenging for students as they must use evidence, logic, and creativity to solve problems and develop explanations about the natural world. Lesson plans must be available for review by Dr. Walter Fajet during classroom walk-throughs. Science teachers must show lessons that align with learning objectives based on state curriculum standards. Components previously described will provide evidence that inquiry-based learning is implemented on a weekly basis. Finally, lesson plans should demonstrate that vocabulary is being infused. Dr. Fajet will share feedback, and the instructional coach will provide support to teachers in planning.

Action Steps to Implement

Purposeful lesson planning that incorporates the 5E model and alignment of lesson plan instruction, activities, and assessments to state standards

Person Responsible	Brandy Curiel (bcuriel@dadeschools.net)

Inclusion of inquiry-based learning activities in lessons

Person Responsible	Brandy Curiel (bcuriel@dadeschools.net)

Monitoring lesson plan development and instructional delivery through observation and feedback

Person Responsible	Walter Fajet (walterfajet@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An additional school wide improvement priority is school safety. In order to comply with CDC guidelines related to COVID-19, the school has taken a number of measures to ensure students and staff are protected as much as possible. These safety measures include: frequent sanitation of high-traffic areas and classrooms, hand-sanitizing stations around the school, water bottle filling stations, social distancing stickers, plexiglass on student desks, and new procedures for entry and exit.
AIE has improved school safety by implementing a closed campus policy. AIE uses the RAPTOR system to screen all visitors that come into the building. Additionally, support staff have designated areas to monitor
students at times including the police officer on campus from bell to bell.

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.

A positive school culture is a key element of school success. Thus, AIE Charter Upper school encourages positive relationships and a shared vision for school success among teachers, staff, students, and parents. The 2019-2020 school culture outcome is to empower students and encourage them to take ownership of their success with the involvement of all stakeholders. Throughout the school year, specific school programs and organizations established communication and interaction among all stakeholders in the school and community through school events, such as fundraisers, curriculum nights, parent nights, and PTO. In addition, students were given autonomy and responsibilities for event organization and execution, which entailed getting other stakeholders involved; they performed at events or were involved in essential duties; and they were recognized for their accolades and achievements.

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
		Total:	$0.00