

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

# Secondary Student Success Center 804



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Secondary Student Success Center 804

7100 NW 17TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

outreach.dadeschools.net

### Demographics

**Principal: Alberto Iber**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Secondary Student Success Center 804

7100 NW 17TH AVE, Miami, FL 33147

outreach.dadeschools.net

### School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 6-12</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Alternative Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">%</p>

### School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2013-14</b>
<b>Grade</b>	F*	F

### 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 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
Clark, Theron	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.
Young, Tabitha	Assistant Principal	
Alonso, Nadeshka	Other	
Baptiste, Belinda	Instructional Coach	Assist with the coordination and implementation of the Comprehensive Mathematics Plan, District Mathematics Curriculum, and Florida's Mathematics Standards.
Cancio, Leonardo	SAC Member	Instructs students, using various teaching methods, including lectures and demonstrations. EESAC Chairperson.
Gonzalez, Alejandro	Instructional Technology	
Lopez-Perez, Vivienne	Administrative Support	Serves as the Local Education Agency (LEA) representative for the Assistant Superintendent, Office of Special Education and Psychological Services.
Perez de Ayllon, Nidia	Administrative Support	
Campbell-McLemore, Mesha	Instructional Coach	Assist with the coordination and implementation of the K-12 Comprehensive Researched-based Reading Plan.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Tuesday 8/25/2020, Alberto Iber

**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.*

**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.*

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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

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

Wednesday 8/28/2019

### 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	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

**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%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	9%	56%	-47%	52%	-43%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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
06	2019	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	9%	53%	-44%	54%	-45%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	8%	40%	-32%	46%	-38%
	2018	0%	38%	-38%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	8%	43%	-35%	48%	-40%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

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

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	90
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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.

The Reading data showed the lowest performance. Percentage of students making learning gains in Reading dropped from 33% to 4%. Percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics dropped from 39% to 15%. Low student attendance and limited small group instruction has had an effect on student performance. The lack of implementation of best practices of data driven and differentiated instruction was also a contribution to the decrease of the learning gains.

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

Reading data showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping from 39% to 4%. Data driven and differentiated instruction were not implemented. Students' poor attendance also contributed to the decrease.

#### 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 percentage of students making learning gains in the State for ELA is 59% compared to EAOP/ S3C students' percentage making learning gains for ELA is 4%. There is a gap of 55%.

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

Mathematics showed the most improvement from 39% to 50%. Small group and individual student instruction was conducted with fidelity.

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

1. 8th grade students attendance below 90%-20% of the 8th grade students demonstrated attendance below 90%.
2. 8th grade students scoring Level 1 on state assessments-48% of 8th grade students scored level 1 on state assessments.

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

1. Percentage of students making learning gains in Reading and Mathematics
2. Daily Attendance
3. Percentage of students tested-90% or higher

4. Bi-weekly Progress monitoring
5. Increase social-emotional counseling with school psychologists

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increase the percentage of students making learning gains in ELA. In order to achieve an overall Commendable rating in ELA, the percentage of students making learning gains need to be increased.

**Measurable Outcome:** To improve the percentage of students making learning gains from 4% to 26% in ELA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tabitha Young (tyoung@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Utilize literacy coaches to share best practices strategies with ELA teachers to implement with students to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** To provide support to teachers infusing standards-based instruction and resources by literacy coaches. Best practices will be implemented and monitored with fidelity in order to increase student achievement.

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Execute small group instruction
2. Model instruction
3. Utilize co-teaching model
4. Conduct data chats with teachers and students.
5. Assist teachers with planning and provide feedback.

**Person Responsible** Mesha Campbell-McLemore (mecamp2129@yahoo.com)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increase the Percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics. In order to achieve an overall Commendable rating in Mathematics, the percentage of students making learning gains need to be increased.

**Measurable Outcome:** To improve the percentage of students making learning gains from 15% to 26% in Mathematics.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tabitha Young (tyoung@dadeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Utilize Mathematics coaches to share best practices strategies with Mathematics teachers to implement with students to increase student achievement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** To provide support to teachers infusing standards-based instruction and resources by Mathematics coaches. Best practices will be implemented and monitored with fidelity in order to increase student achievement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Execute small group instruction
2. Model instruction
3. Utilize co-teaching model
4. Conduct Data chats with students and teachers
5. Assist teachers in planning and provide feedback

**Person Responsible** Belinda Baptiste (baptiste\_b@dadeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Improve percentage of students' daily attendance rate to 75%. School-wide incentive plan will be implemented funded by EESAC and by grants. Implement quarterly award assemblies highlighting academic, I-Ready achievements as well as attendance goals.**

**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.

Conduct parent/student interviews at the home school prior to application submission  
Facilitate Title I Annual Meeting/Open House  
Collaborate the development of School Compacts and PFEP plans with parents' input  
Facilitate EESAC meetings  
Provide Parent Resource Center  
Communicate with parents regularly  
Provide student monthly progress report  
Provide parents with option of receiving weekly progress report by email  
Invite parents/stakeholders to Parenty Academy workshops  
Invite parents to trainings at Title I Neighborhood Resource Center

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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