

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Turner/Guilford/Knight



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Turner/Guilford/Knight

7000 NW 41ST ST, Miami, FL 33166

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Theron Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: 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	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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Turner/Guilford/Knight

7000 NW 41ST ST, Miami, FL 33166

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 7-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p>		<p>2014-15</p>
<p>Grade</p>		<p>F*</p>

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.

Foster relationships with community partners in order to provide wrap-around services to successfully meet the diverse needs of Educational Alternative Outreach Program (EAOP) students

Provide the school's vision statement.

We strive to foster relationships with community partners through innovation, opportunity and access to assist with eradicating the school to jail house pipeline, which is prevalent in our communities.

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
Iber, Alberto	Principal	Provide instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Nortelus, Joella	Instructional Coach	Provide assistance with the coordination and implementation of research-based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.
Lopez-Perez, Vivienne	Administrative Support	Provides specialized knowledge and skills related to student-centered learning processes, techniques of assessment of learning and social adjustment, research design, and modification of behaviors to improve social and academic outcomes for students.
Alonso, Nadeshka	Administrative Support	Collects and analyzes school-wide assessment data to design and implement progress monitoring tools to inform instructional decisions and practices.
Antonini, Enrique	Instructional Coach	Provides assistance with the coordination and implementation of research-based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.
Perez de Ayllon, Nidia	Other	Provides specialized knowledge and skills related to student-centered learning processes, techniques of assessment of learning and social adjustment, research design, and modification of behaviors to improve social and academic outcomes for students.
Clark, Theron	Principal	Provides instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Young, Tabitha	Assistant Principal	Provides instructional leadership to faculty and staff to promote academic excellence, foster collaboration to support a positive school climate, and coordinate all school resources to ensure all stakeholders are equipped with the means to deliver quality educational programs to our students.
Lafaille, Eddy	Assistant Principal	Provides assistance with the coordination and implementation of research-based instructional practices via the coaching model (planning, demonstrating, providing feedback) based on student need as determined by student assessment data.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Wynne, Dan	Teacher, K-12	Provides specialized knowledge and skills related to student-centered learning processes, techniques of assessment of learning and social adjustment, research design, and modification of behaviors to improve social and academic outcomes for students.
Garrote, Rolando	School Counselor	Counsel students to fully develop each student's academic, career, personal, and social abilities; consult with a student's parent or guardian and make referrals as appropriate in consultation with the student's parent or guardian; coordinate people and resources in the school, home, and community; with the assistance of school staff, interpret standardized test results
Gonzalez, Alejandro	Instructional Technology	Provides input in the development of a system-wide and building level programs that enables students to use technology as learning tools. Investigates and disseminates information on best practices for technology integration, sources of information on trends, research and applications related to technology use in the school program.
Cabell, Ben	Attendance/Social Work	School-based social worker counsels students by meeting with them to discuss the issues they face and their root causes. In addition, help students in EAOP with learning problems such as dyslexia and attention deficit disorder, or social problems, including poverty and being a victim of domestic or sexual abuse. They assist students who face social and learning challenges, and help students develop and reinforce correct behavior. Social workers keep notes to document their sessions with students and meet multiple times with students to monitor their progress.
Tomasso, Margarita	Psychologist	Assessment and Diagnosis: Completes a thorough psychological evaluation of each child referred to him/her.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/27/2020, Theron Clark

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

3

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	15%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: 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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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%	59%	56%	0%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	42%	0%	45%	41%
Math Achievement	0%	54%	51%	0%	47%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	51%	45%	0%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	76%	73%	0%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	40%	-40%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	48%	-48%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	72%	-72%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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
BLK											
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	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	87%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Native American Students	
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	0
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

One hundred percent of students tested scored a level 1 on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA. The factors that contributed to last year's low performance was the lack of structured progress monitoring and the inconsistent implementation of data-driven instruction to address students' academic deficiencies.

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

No data component showed a decline. From the prior year, 100% of students tested scored a level 1 on the ELA and Math FSA.

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.

Math achievement showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. 0% of students tested achieved proficiency compared to 58% of students in the state who scored a level 3 or higher. The factors that contributed to last year's low performance was the lack of structured progress monitoring and the inconsistent implementation of data-driven instruction to address students' academic deficiencies.

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

Science assessment results showed the most improvement. 90% of students scored a level 1 and 10% of students scored a level 2 as compared to the previous year in which 100% of students scored a level 1. Our school did not take new actions in this area.

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

Reading

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

1. Gather baseline data on student performance and conduct data chats with students.
2. Analyze performance data and plan for differentiated instruction to address student academic deficiencies across all content areas.
3. Conduct formative assessments to monitor student progress.
4. Provide coaching support to teachers in the areas of data analysis, progress monitoring and planning for instruction.
5. Monitor the implementation of data-driven instruction and provide teachers with constructive feedback.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The percentage of students making learning gains in Reading increased from 36% to 40% from the 2017-2018 to 2018-2019 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	If we successfully implement data-driven differentiated instruction, then we will increase the percentage of students making learning gains from 40% to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alberto Iber (albertoiber@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data-Driven Instruction Based on Formative Assessments Formative assessment is “A planned process in which assessment-elicited evidence of students’ status is used by teachers to adjust their ongoing instructional procedures or by students to adjust their current learning tactics” (Popham, 2008, p. 6).Research shows a trend of improved academic achievement when students are aware of and track their own progress (Marzano, 2017).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will conduct and maintain records of data chats with students utilizing FSA ELA data from the previous school year or results from a teacher-determined baseline assessment in the absence of 2018-2019 FSA ELA scores.
2. Teachers will analyze performance data and plan for differentiated instruction to address student academic deficiencies related to reading comprehension.
3. Teachers will conduct formative assessments to monitor student progress.
4. Teachers will utilize data from formative assessments to conduct on-going data chats.
5. Assistant Principal will monitor the implementation of data-driven instruction and provide teachers with constructive feedback.

Person Responsible Eddy Lafaille (238362@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

This subset of students has varying needs that interfere with academic achievement inclusive of previous homelessness or interactions with child welfare systems, issues related to substance abuse, and significantly low academic performance due to a history of poor school attendance, high absenteeism and dropping out. The school ensures the involvement of all stakeholders through the coordination of academic and social services. Individualized Transition Plans are developed with input from the school counselor, juvenile justice representatives, community-based organization representatives, the student, and their family with assessment data and course grades serving as the source for academic information. This promotes a positive school culture where students' successful transition is the primary focus.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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