

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Jann Mann Educational Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Jann Mann Educational Center

16101 NW 44TH CT, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jamarv Dunn R

Start Date for this Principal: 8/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
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)	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	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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Jann Mann Educational Center

16101 NW 44TH CT, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School 1-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>Alternative Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>%</p>

School Grades History

<p>Year</p>	<p>2014-15</p>	<p>2013-14</p>
<p>Grade</p>	<p>I*</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.

The mission of Jan Mann Educational Center is to provide a positive learning environment where students are motivated to learn new strategies for overcoming dysfunctional interpersonal patterns and to improve academically, socially, and vocationally so that they may, without difficulties, become productive members in an emerging global economy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jan Mann Educational Center sees our students emerging into the world as holistic, culturally tolerant citizens who can contribute, compete and acquire the unique skills critical to becoming world class citizens in an international economy.

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
Green, Geneva	Assistant Principal	As the assistant principals Ms. Green assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development to faculty needs.
Walker, Andrea	Administrative Support	As the assistant principals Ms. Walker assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures the fidelity of the MTSS model by monitoring and evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development to faculty needs.
Morris, Catherine	Administrative Support	As the Administrative Support, Ms. Morris Initiates requisitions for textbooks, requests for maintenance service, requests for personnel action and other support services, and compiles and maintains inventory of property and textbooks. She schedules meetings and maintains appointment calendars, prepares reports, correspondence, memoranda and other documents, and may draft responses to routine correspondence to ensure that there is a smooth operation of the school.
Odi, Olubukola	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor, Mr. Olubukola acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Floyd, Michael	Teacher, K-12	As an instructor, Mr. Floyd acts as the liaison for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Dunn, Ja Marv	Principal	As principal, Ja Marv Dunn serves as school's instructional leader. Mr. Dunn provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. He uses data to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Mr. Dunn establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and the appropriate Response to Intervention (RtI).

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/27/2020, Jamarv Dunn R

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.*

7

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-12
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)	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	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	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	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	0
	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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

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	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
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	19	23	24	11	5	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	23	8	6	0	0	60

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	13	30	36	10	10	1	1	101

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	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	46	47	17	20	8	2	167
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	19	23	24	11	5	0	0	82
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	23	8	6	0	0	60

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	13	30	36	10	10	1	1	101

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%	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
	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)

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	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
	2018	11%	54%	-43%	51%	-40%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	11%	60%	-49%	56%	-45%
	2018	3%	59%	-56%	58%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	18%	55%	-37%	55%	-37%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
10	2019	27%	53%	-26%	53%	-26%
	2018	17%	54%	-37%	53%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		27%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	3%	40%	-37%	46%	-43%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	10%	43%	-33%	48%	-38%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	67%	-67%
2018	6%	65%	-59%	65%	-59%
Compare		-6%			

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
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	25%	63%	-38%	61%	-36%
2018	13%	59%	-46%	62%	-49%
Compare		12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	21%	54%	-33%	57%	-36%
2018	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
Compare		21%			

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										27	
FRL										21	
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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	7
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	28
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	83%

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
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	27
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Hispanic Students	
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	21
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.

A comparison of iReady data for the first two diagnostic periods reflects an 18% decrease in Reading scores among 7th-grade students. Truancy is a concern among students. As a result of truancy, students miss valuable instructional time to address deficiencies in Reading. Also, the population of the school is transient, some students enroll in the school just prior to the AP2 assessment period.

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

In 2018 7th grade students were at 6.6% mastery when given the Florida Standards Assessment. 7th-grade students were at 0% proficient when given the Florida Standards Assessment in 2019. This reflects a near 7% decrease from the previous year. This decline can be attributed in part to truancy among 7th-grade students. Also, a significant percentage of students were retained.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap, when compared to the state average, was Biology. No students achieved proficiency on the 2019 biology EOC, however, the state average was 68%, representing a gap of -68%. Factors that contributed to this data finding was having a teacher who was certified in middle-grade science, but not in biology. Student attendance was also a contributing factor.

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

Statewide assessments were suspended for the 2019-2020 school year. However, The greatest area of improvement was in Math. From 2018 to the 2019 administration of the Algebra I assessments proficiency increased by 12 percentage points. Also, the percent of students earning a learning gain increased from 30% to 53%.

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

Based on the Early Warning Systems Data in part I, two potential areas of concern are student attendance and the percent of students earning a level 1 on statewide assessments.

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

1. Student Attendance
2. Increase the percent of students earning a learning gain in Reading
3. Increase the percent of students earning a learning gain in Math
4. Increase proficiency on the 7th-grade Civics EOC
5. Increase proficiency on the 10th-grade Biology EOC

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A large percentage of students have an attendance of less than 90%. Low attendance leads to higher rates of course failure, grade retention, and poor performance on state assessments.

Measurable Outcome: there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students who have the attendance that is at less than 90%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ja Marv Dunn (jaydunn@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To address student attendance, the school will use the student services department. They will be assigned specific students to monitor student attendance, academic progress, and social-emotional well-being. They will maintain a calling log, parent contact log, and student meeting log to monitor student progress and provide intervention as needed. The leadership debriefs with student services weekly regarding the progress of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The School Leadership Team determined that having specific students assigned to members of the student services team increases the home-school connection leading to positive academic and social-emotional outcomes for students.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: There is a large percentage of students who score Level 1 on the state assessment. 26% of students in ELA earned a learning gain on the 2019 administration of the Reading Assessment.

Measurable Outcome: The percent of students earning a learning gain will increase from 26% to 50 % on the 2020 administration of the Florida Standards Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Geneva Green (genevagreen@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The ELA department will implement small group data-driven interventions. Teachers will engage in ongoing progress monitoring and remediation as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using data to make instructional decisions allows teachers to provide targeted, standards-based instruction, enrichment, and remediation to meet students' academic needs.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school-based leadership team engages in weekly meetings to progress monitor the implementation of strategies aligned to priorities. During meetings, adjustments are made to ensure the achievement of goals and priorities.

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.

The school addresses building positive school culture and the environment by ensuring all stakeholders are involved and implementing Restorative Justice Practices (RJP). The school engages all stakeholders through a variety of mediums including meetings and activities. We implement protocols to maintain a healthy and safe school environment, promote staff-student connections, and Promote a growth mindset.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00