

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Neva King Cooper 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Neva King Cooper Educational Center

151 NW 5TH ST, Homestead, FL 33030

<http://nkc.dadeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Tracy Roos

Start Date for this Principal: 9/27/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Neva King Cooper Educational Center

151 NW 5TH ST, Homestead, FL 33030

<http://nkc.dadeschools.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School PK-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>Special 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

Year	2011-12
Grade	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.

The mission of Neva King Cooper Educational Center is to give all our students the tools needed to communicate independently, enhance normalization, and grow/develop to their maximum potential. This will take place through the use of assisted technology, an individualized curriculum, and the assistance of our greatest asset, our stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Neva King Cooper Educational Center is committed to providing innovative learning experiences and educational excellence to all.

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
Roos, Tracy	Principal	Principal, Dr. Roos serves as the school's instructional leader. She provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings. Dr. Roos establishes high expectations for all students and ensures that the school-based team is implementing Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS).
Sachs, Holly	Teacher, ESE	As an instructor and department chair, Ms. Sachs serves as the liaison to the leadership team for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Placido, Melissa	Other	As the electives department chair, Ms. Placido serves as the liaison to the leadership team for her department and supports the implementation of the MTSS process.
Forbes, Carla	Other	As professional development liaison and department chair, Ms. Forbes serves as the liaison to the leadership team for her grade level and supports the implementation of the MTSS process. She develops and provides professional development that address the needs of the instructional staff.
English, Jodi	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Alicia Fernandez assists the principal in implementing the vision and mission for Neva King Cooper Educational Center. 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 with faculty needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 9/27/2020, Tracy Roos

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

23

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
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	2	1	2	5	0	4	4	7	4	7	10	6	30	82
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	0	10
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

Sunday 9/27/2020

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	2	1	2	5	0	4	4	7	4	7	10	6	30	82
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	2	1	2	5	0	4	4	7	4	7	10	6	30	82
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	0	0	10
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%	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 (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
SWD		20			23						
BLK		8			10						
HSP		36									
FRL		21			22						
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	7
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	43
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	7
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	5
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	12
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	9
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.

Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA English Language Arts (ELA) data there is a significant decrease in grade 4. Twenty-five percent of the 5 students that took the FSAA English Language Arts Assessment and scored at a Level 1, as compared to the 2017-2018 where 50% of the 5 students scored a Level 1. This demonstrated a decrease of 25 percentage points. The factor that contributes to this data is the teachers need to focus on standards based instruction as well as integrating technology to the classroom instructional approach. In addition, students intellectual disabilities and lack of communication. Using appropriate instructional approach to meet student needs.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA English Language Arts (ELA) data there is a significant decrease in grade 8. Seventy percent of the students who took the FSAA English Language Arts Assessment scored at a Level 2, as compared to the 2017-2018 where 88% of the students scored a Level 2 on the FSAA ELA assessment. This demonstrated a decrease of 18 percentage points. The factor that contributes to this data is the teachers need to focus on standards based instruction as well as integrating technology to the classroom instructional approach. In addition, students intellectual disabilities and lack of communication. Using appropriate instructional approach to meet student needs.

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 ELA data component showed the greatest gap when compared to the state. The contributing factor was the change in curricular resources and move toward standards-based planning. In addition, 4th grade began writing as an open response item.

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

Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA Mathematics Data, there is a significant improvement in students making learning gains in grade 6 Mathematics. 33% of students took the FSAA Mathematics Assessment and scored a level 2 average as compared to 2017-2018 where 20% of the students scored a Level 2 average. This demonstrated a 13-percentage point increase. Actions taken include data driven and hand-on instruction.

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

The Early Warning system identifies attendance as an area of concern. Where we have a 84% attendance rate. This EWS is significant however, many students at Neva King Cooper Educational Center are students with significant intellectual disabilities and medical needs resulting in hospitalizations and inability to attend school

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

1. Focus on Writing Across the curriculum and vocabulary development.
2. Focusing on Standards – Based Planning ensuring students are taught and assessed in the classroom based on grade level standards.
3. Create a Positive Behavior Intervention Strategy System (PBIS) to ensure all are following a school and classroom management system that will positively impact the classroom and create a safe learning environment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the 2018-2019 FSAA English Language Arts (ELA) data there is a significant decrease in grade 8. Seventy percent of the students who took the FSAA English Language Arts Assessment scored at a Level 2, as compared to the 2017-2018 where 88% of the students scored a Level 2 on the FSAA ELA assessment. This demonstrated a decrease of 18 percentage points.

Measurable Outcome: If we continue to implement instructional practices specifically relating to standard-aligned instruction , and conduct classroom walkthroughs, then we can experience improvement in the FSAA ELA achievement as evidenced by FSAA results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alicia Fernandez (305789@dadeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy include Academic Vocabulary Instruction, technology integration and differentiated instruction

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If standard-aligned instruction facilitated through differentiated instruction, the teaching of academic vocabulary, and the integration of technology is implemented with the appropriate resources, intention and fidelity, then the percentage of students making adequate growth will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will provide additional professional development in standards-based planning/instruction to ensure instructional practices are focused on learning and on grade-level. In addition, classroom walk-throughs, collaborative planning and Best Practices will be the focus for all content areas,

Person Responsible Tracy Roos (pr0921@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The area of focus is Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned instruction. The actions needed to sustain Standard-aligned instruction which will be led by the leadership team are the following: taking ownership for students' learning and believing in students' ability to learn regardless of barriers.

Additionally, the leadership team will ensure that teachers are also well versed in the technology programs being implemented so that it's use is a complement to the teacher/student instruction being given as well as knowing when to make adjustments based on student data. Teachers will also be taught how to properly schedule students to take advantage of the technology provided.

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 faculty and staff at Neva King Cooper Educational Center works rigorously to keep parents informed of their child's academic progress. Parents are provided with quarterly progress reports, report cards, and they participate in parent/teacher conferences. Team parent conferences for identified under-performing Homebound students are routinely scheduled to address their academic and behavioral needs. In addition, quarterly student progress reports are issued to all students to provide parents student's current academic performance. The school's social worker is used as a family resource to assist them with making contact and referrals to outside agencies as needed. Staff works with families and school to ensure their successful transition back to the student's home school following dismissal from Homebound placement.

Our school considers counseling for students entering the Hospitalized/Homebound program, especially those students with a psychiatric medical diagnosis. District clinicians provide counseling services to students identified through IEP team meetings to be in need of individual counseling. As needed, Functional Assessment of Behaviors (FAB) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIP) will be developed and implemented for identified students.

The school leadership team uses a multifaceted process to identify and align resources to meet the needs of students. The leadership team, comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principal, and Department Heads, meets weekly. The team collaborates regarding decisions impacting student performance. Adjustments are made as necessary. The Principal has ultimate responsibility for all budgetary decisions, but input from the members of the leadership team is sought and valued. The Assistant Principal is assigned to monitor the property control inventory including instructional materials and technology resources to ensure they are allocated

to maximize student performance. Most personnel are funded through state and local funds. Nutrition Program funds help provide free breakfast to all student's school-based students and free or reduced lunch to qualifying students. IDEA funds are used to support Exceptional Education students and programs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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