

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ferrell Middle Magnet School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cara Diehl

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Hillsborough 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

We empower our girls to excel in rigorous academics and character education while fostering them to be positive forces in our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Developing confident, dynamic, educated young women.

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
French, Karen	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Cara Diehl

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.*

5

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes

2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	155	198	172	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	51	47	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	32	27	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	57	33	0	0	0	0	125

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	3

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	11	5	3	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	0	0	0	0	46

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	230	194	188	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	10	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	27	0	0	0	0	56
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	22	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	72	59	0	0	0	0	238

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	8	35	32	0	0	0	75

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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	2	0	0	0	0	34

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	230	194	188	0	0	0	0	612	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	10	0	0	0	0	23	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	27	0	0	0	0	56	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	22	0	0	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	72	59	0	0	0	0	238	

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	8	35	32	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	11	2	0	0	0	0	34	

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	53%	51%	54%	49%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	52%	54%	50%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	47%	47%	40%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	62%	55%	58%	60%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	72%	57%	57%	66%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75%	52%	51%	58%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	43%	47%	51%	48%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	67%	72%	76%	66%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	54%	0%	52%	2%
	2018	45%	52%	-7%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	54%	53%	1%	56%	-2%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	48%	49%	-1%	55%	-7%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	65%	62%	3%	54%	11%
	2018	63%	61%	2%	54%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019	44%	31%	13%	46%	-2%
	2018	54%	29%	25%	45%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	43%	47%	-4%	48%	-5%
	2018	53%	48%	5%	50%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	75%	67%	8%	71%	4%
2018	75%	65%	10%	71%	4%
Compare		0%			
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	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%
2018	95%	63%	32%	62%	33%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	57%	33%	57%	33%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		-10%			

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	15	44	47	28	58	74	12	32			
ELL	33	55	59	58	80	82	25	67			
BLK	45	55	55	55	66	76	38	72	88		
HSP	52	62	65	67	76	70	47	69	90		
MUL	58	68		58	76						
WHT	74	65	46	76	82	77	58	86	95		
FRL	48	58	57	58	70	74	37	69	91		

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
SWD	7	33	33	28	63	52	23	33			
ELL	31	54	64	47	73	70		70			
ASN	100										
BLK	39	51	49	56	71	69	49	71	96		
HSP	51	58	57	64	73	65	49	77	83		
MUL	47	60		67	73						
WHT	67	60		81	76		69	88	93		
FRL	43	53	52	58	71	66	47	72	95		
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
SWD	7	34	38	28	53	55	17	47			
ELL	43	54	50	41	63	60	20	50			
ASN	91	64		100	100						
BLK	39	42	34	53	60	54	38	71	100		
HSP	52	56	51	58	66	60	53	76	92		
MUL	50	50		56	69						
WHT	71	66		87	76	73	67	91	95		
FRL	42	46	39	55	64	57	42	70	96		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	650
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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.

ESSA subgroup ESE (ELA) 39%. Reading levels(students are in the phase of learning to read instead of reading to learn), learned self-helplessness. Teacher need to differentiate the instruction (literacy strategies) in order to increase student engagement.

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

Science (from 52% to 43%). Movement of STEP UP students (missing 7th grade science skills), Reading ability of students impacts their ability to understand the text of the test. Teacher need to focus on critical thinking skills.

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.

6th grade math (Ferrell 48% , State 55% -7% difference). Students coming to us without basic skills (multiplication, addition, subtraction, division). Much time is needed to reteach what they did not learn in elementary. Teacher need more support in differentiating instruction.

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

ELA achievement level up by 5%, ELA learning gains up by 5% and up by 6% with BQ in ELA. BQ in math was up 9%. Focused on school-wide literacy strategies of RARE, and introduction to DI. Targeted support for BQ in math at all 3 grade leves (intensive math class and pull out support from 8 period model).

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

The number of student that increase from 6th to 7th grade with 2 or more indicators (6th - 8, 7th - 38, 8th - 32).

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

1. Increase teacher understanding, planning and implementation of ELA standards and literacy strategies using DI.
2. Increase teacher understanding of student data in order to plan and implement differentiated and engaging lessons.
- 3.

4.

5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>We will continue to develop our culture for learning by focusing on the academic engagement of our students. Teachers will plan, implement and assess standards-aligned instruction that engage students. Teachers will use differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students.</p> <p>Our students will become more engaged in rigorous, academically focused and collaborative learning, positively impacting achievement.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>If we effectively implement high leverage-strategies which support standards-based instruction, then percent of students achieving proficiency in: ELA will increase from 53% to 56%, Math will increase from 62% to 65%, Civics will increase from 75% to 78%, SSA will increase from 43% to 46%,and MS Acceleration 92% to 95%.</p> <p>If we effectively implement high leverage-strategies which support standards-based instruction, then percent of students achieving learninggains in: ELA will increase from 60% to 63%, ELA BQ will increase from 58% to 61%, Math will increase from 72% to 75%, and Math BQ will increase 75% to 78%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use HOTS (ACE) & RICER learner attributes 2. Use of Kagan collaborative structures and targeted literacy skills 3. Supported lesson planning with focus on differentiated instruction with Achieve 3000. <p>HOTS - Higher-orderthinking skills put advanced cognitive demand on students. Higher-order questions promote critical thinking skills because these types of questions expect students to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information instead of simply recalling facts. RICER Learner Attributes are foundational skills to Cambridge International Schools.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Collaborative structures (Kagan) are instructional strategies designed to promote cooperation, communication and authentic discussion in the classroom, boost students' confidence and retain their interest in classroom interaction. Academic Moves teaches students essential skills (reading, writing, and problem solving skills) needed for mastering the ELA FL Standards.</p> <p>Supporting lesson planning through PLCs, with coach support, will ensure alignment to the rigor of the standards and incorporation of appropriate collaborative strategies.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for teachers in HOTS (ACE) & RICER learner attributes aligned to standards based instruction.
2. Implement Kagan-based strategies in all content areas This will be done by incorporating "make and take" PD opportunities into faculty mtgs/PLCs once a quarter to support collaborative strategies for classroom use.
3. Bi-weekly walk-throughs by leadership team to monitor use of HOTS and collaborative structures as well as implementation of lessons aligned to the rigor of the standards.
4. LA, Rdg, SS, and Science will incorporate Achieve 3000 to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the students.

Person Responsible Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will target our under-performing subgroup (SWD) with extended learning opportunities and best-practices strategies. Rationale Our SWD will be given extended learning opportunities through RtI Tier 2 & 3 support with the very best teaching strategies.
Measurable Outcome:	If we effectively implement differentiated extended learning opportunities which support standards-based instruction for SWD, then percent of SWD meeting the ESSA Federal Index requirement will increase from 39% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Extended learning opportunities 2. Best teaching strategies to support a Strong Tier 1 3. Monitor RtI/MTSS Tier 2 and 3 with implementation for fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to intervention (RtI) has one the highest effect sizes, as reported in "Visible Learning". Extended learning opportunities (time) is also indicated as a positive intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide PD for teacher regarding teaching best practices for Inclusion.
2. Target SWD for push-in tutoring by ESE teachers and RtI Coach
3. Provide Learning Strategies class to allow for targeted students additional support and extended time support.
4. RtI to monitor Tier 2 and 3 interventions to ensure that they are a supplement to Tier 1 instruction.
5. IEP goals will be monitored by case manager on a quarterly basis in conjunction with Quarterly Report Cards.
6. Achieve 3000 (literacy) and Moby Max (math) will be used to for added practice and progress monitoring of the students.

Person Responsible Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Student Success Coach and RtI Coach will strategically monitor and support students EWS.
2. School Wide use of Canvas and streamlined technology supports will be used by all faculty to increase students ability to function independently and proactively.

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.

We work to communicate every students' progress to the parents/guardians by sending home bi-weekly progress reports and holding quarterly Student Led Conferences. School staff, students, parents and the community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. Our goal is build positive relationships with families. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by communicating through ParentLink, Canvas, school website. We facilitate annual Mother Daughter Day Event and Father

Daughter Dance in order to provide unique families experiences on our school campus. We have a success coach that works with both students and parents on having a successful transition to middle and high school.

Examples of Events: Open House, Hispanic Heritage Month Saturday School Celebration, SAC Mtgs, Parent Link, Conference Nights, Volunteer Orientation/Recognition, Great American Teach-In, , Parent Workshop: Transition to Middle School, Cyber-bullying.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$243,780.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$95,000.00
			Notes: Success Coach: works with 100 students (EWS of 2 or more indicators) and Step Up students. Works with parents to increase family involvement and student support. Facilitate school wide SEL initiative			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$47,500.00
			Notes: Reading Coach - Provide support, mentoring, and assistance within school. Serve a resource for identification of instructional strategies and materials among all subjects and interventions to address diverse learning needs. Co-teach and conduct demonstration lessons. Assist teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction. Collaborate with teacher teams/depts to improve instruction and solve problems that limit student achievement. Observe instruction and provide feedback.			

	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$47,500.00
			Notes: Math Resource Teacher - Provide support, mentoring, and assistance within school. Serve as a resource for identification of instructional strategies and materials and interventions to address diverse learning needs. Co-teach and conduct demonstration lessons. Assist teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction. Collaborate with teacher teams/depts to improve instruction and solve problems that limit student achievement. Observe instruction and provide feedback. Conduct small group tutoring of targeted groups of students.			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A	0.5	\$47,500.00
			Notes: Rtl Coach - Provide support, mentoring, and assistance within school. Serve as a resource for differentiating instruction at all tier levels. Provide training for DI.. Assist teachers in planning, delivering, and assessing instruction. Collaborate with teacher teams/depts to improve instruction and solve problems that limit student achievement. Lead MTSS team in examining data and building support plans. Pull and examine data. Weekly progress monitoring to determine need for more interventions. PD in the use of data.			
	5100	369-Technology-Related Rentals	3001 - Ferrell Middle Magnet School	Title, I Part A	0.0	\$6,280.00
			Notes: Moby Max - Use software to help help progress monitor students and differentiate instruction. Students will use this in Lang Arts, Math, and Reading weekly Pear Deck - Use software to help help progress monitor students and differentiate instruction. Pear Deck will be used ALL teachers and students to building daily/weekly formative assessments. USA Test Prep -Use software to help help progress monitor students and differenitate instruction. This will be used in all Civics classes an additional resource for teachers and students.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
					Total:	\$243,780.00