

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Franklin 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Franklin Middle Magnet School

3915 E 21ST AVE, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Konrad Mccree

Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Franklin Middle Magnet School

3915 E 21ST AVE, Tampa, FL 33605

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</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>76%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>85%</p>

School Grades History

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

In a single gender environment, we will deliver an education which will inspire and empower young men to master rigorous academic standards by instilling in them a strong work ethic and expecting them to model core values in both school and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Molding young men of distinction who will achieve greatness

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
Haley, John	Principal	Supervise administrative staff Supervise instructional/non-instructional staff Oversee management of facilities and grounds Supervise and coordinate preparation of Annual Report of School Progress Regulate use and rental of school facilities Supervise and coordinate operation of total school program Oversees faculty and staff evaluations PTSA liaison Coordinates School Improvement Team Approves all assemblies and field trips
Hall, Gregory	Assistant Principal	Coordinates school activities with the school principal and staff members. Will research issues related to law, student safety and community social problems, and presents them to students, parents, and faculty and staff members. Informs faculty members of available programs. Participates in school functions and after school activities, when possible. Investigates, documents, and notifies Unit Supervisor and school principal of incidents involving gangs or student conflicts that may lead to the disruption of school functions. Establishes a liaison between the school and the surrounding community to give advice or support to residents and businesses regarding law enforcement matters. Conferences with students, parents and faculty members regarding problems of a law enforcement or Crime Prevention nature. As time and duty permits, attends student, parent, faculty, and community meetings to solicit support and understanding of the program. Member of the Crisis Team. Any other duties assigned by principal.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/2/2020, Konrad Mccree

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.*

1

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	73	112	131	0	0	0	0	316
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	48	45	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	14	2	0	0	0	0	24
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	31	37	55	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	45	61	0	0	0	0	133

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	2	6	2	0	0	0	0	10

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	13	6	16	0	0	0	0	35
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

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	165	153	173	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	16	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	36	40	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	33	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	53	50	0	0	0	0	190

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	19	28	0	0	0	0	60

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	2	4	12	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	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	165	153	173	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	16	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	36	40	0	0	0	0	85
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	33	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	53	50	0	0	0	0	190

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	19	28	0	0	0	0	60

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	2	4	12	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	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	46%	51%	54%	51%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	52%	54%	55%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	47%	47%	41%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	49%	55%	58%	54%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	57%	57%	61%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	51%	50%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	47%	47%	51%	52%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	67%	72%	71%	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	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	52%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	47%	54%	-7%	52%	-5%
	2018	47%	52%	-5%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	48%	53%	-5%	56%	-8%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	58%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	62%	-3%	54%	5%
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				
08	2019	14%	31%	-17%	46%	-32%
	2018	15%	29%	-14%	45%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	47%	-1%	48%	-2%
	2018	52%	48%	4%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	70%	67%	3%	71%	-1%
2018	68%	65%	3%	71%	-3%
Compare		2%			

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	80%	63%	17%	61%	19%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	83%	63%	20%	62%	21%
Compare		-3%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	57%	38%	57%	38%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		-5%			

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	26	56	48	28	43	46	25	46	80		
ELL	27	34	35	30	46	53		48			
BLK	35	48	46	35	50	38	29	60	69		
HSP	52	55	48	52	51	57	50	74	85		
MUL	41	57		45	57						
WHT	61	60	38	72	62	39	77	81	88		
FRL	38	50	46	40	49	44	33	65	80		
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	26	50	50	28	46	43	35	41			
ELL	21	38	50	36	36	31					
ASN	64	64		82	82						
BLK	33	41	42	34	42	43	36	59	76		
HSP	46	49	56	58	51	31	56	72	84		
MUL	48	54		48	54						
WHT	62	50	59	70	61	71	74	89	88		
FRL	37	45	50	44	48	40	49	60	78		
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	25	40	26	22	46	44	50	48			
ELL	32	48	40	43	46	18		40			
BLK	36	42	36	39	53	45	33	61	87		
HSP	55	60	38	57	64	55	71	76	91		
MUL	57	65		57	68						
WHT	69	69	53	74	71	75	70	82	90		
FRL	42	49	37	45	55	46	42	66	92		

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	54
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	489
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
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	58
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	50
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	64
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	49
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.

6th grade Math proficiency - 31%
 Teachers need to differentiate the instruction 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.

8th grade Science proficiency: -6%
 The movement of STEP-UP students. They were missing all of their 7th grade science skills. Reading ability of students impacts their ability to understand the questions on the test. Reading coach will help teachers 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.

8th grade Math proficiency: -32%

The movement of STEP-UP students. We need to offer targeted support and pull-out support for tutorials to fill the gaps from 7th grade.

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

6th grade ELA proficiency: +6%

Targets support through tutorials during lunches with a focus on standards mastery. Reading coach works with Social Studies teachers on reading strategies.

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

Suspensions

ELA & Math failures

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

1. Increase teacher understanding of planning and implementation of appropriate assessments.
2. Increase teacher understanding of data analysis to drive instruction.
3. Increase teacher understanding of differentiated instruction.
4. Student success coach and RTI coach will monitor and support EWS students.
5. Schoolwide use of Canvas and streamlined technology will be used by faculty to increase students' ability to function independently.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Below 40 percentile - identified

Measurable Outcome:	<p>Goal - higher than 41% based on assigned testing</p> <p>Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels; and especially our ELL Learners. Reading Coach will assist with literacy strategies.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>John Haley (john.haley@hcps.net)</p> <p>Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels; and especially our ELL Learners. Reading Coach will assist with literacy strategies.</p> <p>Support the implementation of high quality instructional practices during core and intervention blocks:</p> <p>Implemented use of heritage language dictionaries, glossaries and picture dictionaries in the classroom on a daily basis</p> <p>Modify appropriate instructional program to meet the needs of ESOL students by: concrete first, then abstract use of visual representations reducing non-essential details using media developing schema checking word choice and sentence order semantic webbing learning centers use of audio visual technology</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Check for content comprehension with: drama experiments learning logs dialogue journals role play reading logs writing headlines story summaries strip stories cloze exercise.</p> <p>Used "Pre" Activities such as: total physical response (TPR), realia, demonstrations</p> <p>Utilized instructional approaches to address language learning styles by: thematic approach student experience cooperative learning</p> <p>Clarified directions and assisted him/her with assignments, the syllabus, wrote assignments and page numbers on the board, wrote instructions and problems using shorter and less complex sentence structure</p> <p>Explain special vocabulary terms in words known to the English Language Learners, providing pictures, gestures and realia to illustrate new words and terms</p>

Speak using intonations and pauses, stressed caregiver speech: slower and simpler, emphasized extension and elaboration, modeled speaking and questioning techniques for students

Provide visual context clues, and checked comprehension throughout lesson when presenting material orally

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research supports the use of strategies listed in previous section; Identifying essential ESOL Strategies that teachers need to use to make your instruction comprehensible to the English Language Learners in class.

Action Steps to Implement

Communicate ELL data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. Targeted academic lunch tutorials offered by teachers, focusing on ELL learners monitored by our Reading Coach and ILT.

Person Responsible John Haley (john.haley@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Review school-wide assessment data on an ongoing basis in order to identify instructional needs across the school and all grade levels; and especially our ELL Learners. Reading Coach will assist with literacy strategies.

Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. Targeted academic lunch tutorials offered by teachers, focusing on our SWD and bottom quartile monitored by our Reading Coach and ILT. Review progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains.

By focusing on students with one or more early warning indicators, student success rates will increase producing a more positive school culture. Our Student Success Coach will work with students in small groups. Increase use of planner for progress monitoring and home/school communication as directed by our Student Success Coach.

Improve home/school communication including Spanish translation of all school news and increase of written communication to accompany audio ParentLink messages, monitored by the PFE liaison.

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 child's progress to the parents by sending home quarterly progress alerts and holding parent teacher conferences. School staff, students, parents, and the community work collaboratively to improve skills and habits for personal and academic success. Our goal is to build positive relationships with families. We encourage parents to participate in all of our events by sending home newsletters and flyers, making parent link calls, and posting everything on our website and social media.

- Open House
- SAC/PTSA
- Newsletter/Websites/Canvas/Marque
- Parent Link/Remind (phone text system)
- Conference Nights
- Volunteer Orientation/Recognition
- Committee Events
- Great American Teach-In
- Ongoing community partnerships
- Volunteer program

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: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00