Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Denyse Rive IR O   Start Date for this Principal: 7/2/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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

Macfarlane Park Elementary Magnet School

1721 N MACDILL AVE, Tampa, FL 33607

[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)
Elementary School KG-5	No	43%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	71%

School Grades History

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

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 cultivate in each student the desire to grow in wisdom, to nurture an open and curious mind, and to serve others with a generous spirit.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The school's vision is to create an advanced elementary program where students become aware of the shared humanity that binds all people together and develop respect for the variety of cultures and attitudes that add to the richness of life.

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
Riveiro, Denyse	Principal	
Hartle, Angela	Instructional Coach	
Van Hise, Jake	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Denyse Rive IR O

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.*
18

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
30

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	66	70	57	53	58	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	366
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	62	57	53	59	62	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	62	57	53	59	62	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	82%	52%	57%	79%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	55%	58%	66%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	54%	63%	81%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	78%	57%	62%	65%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	46%	51%	49%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	84%	50%	53%	84%	48%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%	
	2018	84%	53%	31%	57%	27%	
Same Grade Comparison	-1%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	82%	55%	27%	58%	24%	
	2018	85%	55%	30%	56%	29%	
Same Grade Comparison	-3%						
Cohort Comparison	-2%						
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%	
	2018	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison	18%						
Cohort Comparison	-4%						

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	78%	54%	24%	62%	16%	
	2018	86%	55%	31%	62%	24%	
Same Grade Comparison	-8%						
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	84%	57%	27%	64%	20%	
	2018	93%	57%	36%	62%	31%	
Same Grade Comparison	-9%						
Cohort Comparison	-2%						
05	2019	91%	54%	37%	60%	31%	
	2018	77%	54%	23%	61%	16%	
Same Grade Comparison	14%						
Cohort Comparison	-2%						

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	84%	51%	33%	53%	31%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	68%	52%	16%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison	16%					
Cohort Comparison						

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	73			73							
ELL	73	68		77	74						
ASN	90	58		98	84		80				
BLK	77	73		61	67						
HSP	71	60	57	73	64	45	71				
WHT	88	69		91	86	82	95				
FRL	75	64	59	72	68	54	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
ELL	53	35	30	77	71						
ASN	94	76		100	95						
BLK	68	69		68	54						
HSP	66	55	47	76	66	60	61				
WHT	84	54		92	83		89				
FRL	60	53	50	71	64	47	55				
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	40			53							
ELL	48	50		70	75						
ASN	91	65		94	76		100				
BLK	54	63	55	50	42	36					
HSP	72	61	54	78	70	53	85				
WHT	89	74		89	63		88				
FRL	70	57	38	70	57	39	75				

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)	N/A

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	73
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	73
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	70
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	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	85
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	68
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.

Hispanic students in the bottom quartile performed lowest in both ELA and math. The main contributing factor is that these students are bilingual and many use a language other than English at home. Our teachers are almost all monolingual and deliver instruction in English. This is not a trend, as in the previous year, the scores of Hispanic students in the bottom quartile increased.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA and math achievement of the students in the bottom quartile. One contributing factor is that many of these students are given ESE instruction from a separate ESE teacher. Last year, the ESE teacher was only half time, so she was not able to deliver instruction to these students on a daily basis. Another

contributing factor is that our teachers did not feel confident in their abilities to differentiate instruction to these particular students, due to a lack of sufficient planning time.

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 largest gap between our performance and that of the state is in ELA achievement. In this area, our results were 24 points higher than that of the state average. We attribute much of the success of our ELA scores to our IB program that focuses on the use of authentic resources in ELA. Our students utilize articles, research and literature that relate to the IB units of study and have purpose in the classroom and a connection to real life.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was fifth grade science achievement. In order to improve this area form the previous year, our school created a hands-on science laboratory, in which students could participate in hands-on activities and experiments lead by the homeroom teacher as well as the gifted science teacher.

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

1. Bottom quartile gains in ELA and math

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

1. Increasing learning gains of the bottom quartile
2. Time for teacher planning and collaboration
3. Differentiated instruction for all levels
4. Differentiated PD for teachers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the varied needs of our students, we will offer multiple modes of instruction to make learning accessible to all.
Measurable Outcome:	Every teacher will have course content available online in order for all students to access their educational resources from any location. Also, all school-wide events will be hosted virtually in order for all families to participate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers and staff will participate in professional development related to creating educational content on the CANVAS platform. All teachers will also receive a CANVAS user guide in order to become familiar with the online platform.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This year, students are participating in school both online and in-person.

Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will participate in professional development related to using CANVAS to deliver instruction.

Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

All school-wide events will be hosted in a virtual setting.

Person Responsible	Angela Hartle (angela.hartle@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher collaboration, professional development and time for reflection are vital to addressing individual student needs and improving student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will have sufficient planning time for collaboration and professional development catered to their interests and needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will actively participate in effective PLC's and differentiated professional development.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers are able to collaborate with their peers and have choice in professional development, they are more willing to try new instructional strategies that can have a positive effect on student learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master Schedule will provide uninterrupted time on Mondays for teachers to plan in PLCs
2. One Tuesday a month will be set aside for teacher PD, in which teachers will be able to choose from multiple opportunities for training.
3. The ESE teacher, gifted teachers, and Assistant Principal will participate in grade level PLC meetings.
4. Each teacher will act as a member of a curriculum area team to vertically plan from Kindergarten through fifth grade in each academic subject area.
5. Teachers will be encouraged to participate in professional organizations and leadership opportunities outside of the school.

Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All students, especially those in the bottom quartile, will benefit from access to a personalized learning environment and excellent extra-curricular activities designed to maximize their academic achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	Student academic achievement data points will increase as a result of quality, differentiated academic and extra-curriculum programming being offered to all students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use small group instruction to differentiate for the various academic levels of students in the classroom. Gifted teachers will also provide small group instruction to reteach concepts to students that did not show mastery of specific concepts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction is proven to be an effective method for delivering instruction and allows teachers to narrow in on specific students that have not yet mastered similar concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan Extended Learning Program (ELP) activities to support students in Reading
and Math by identifying standards needed to be reinforced for individual students.
2. In PLC's teachers will analyze student work samples and assessment data and plan to
address individual student needs.
3. Learning Walks will provide teachers with opportunities to observe other teachers at
Macfarlane with a focus on differentiation in Mathematics and Junior Great Books
Shared Inquiry Discussions.
4. Teachers of Gifted and Homeroom Teachers will purposefully plan to provide
targeted small group instruction differentiated based on real time data.
5. Effectively plan long term investigations (LTI) and problem based learning to engage all
learners.

Person Responsible	Jake Van Hise (jake.vanhise@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will monitor the progress of students in the bottom quartile through data chats with teachers, data analysis with grade level teams, and continuous communication regarding student performance.

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.

Our school community promotes a school environment which welcomes and embraces the diversity of cultures and perspectives. Our school's community partnerships are committed to the community we serve and mirror values we teach our students. Teachers lead monthly parent involvement workshops sharing our school PYP curriculum information educating parents about the curriculum.They articulate the benefits and superior attributes of our magnet program to improve parent understanding and participation in the education process. Family "Evenings of" in math/science, literature, arts and culture provide interactive learning activities with students, parents, teachers and community members. Monthly online newsletters and agendas encourage students to reflect on their learning and the school's website provides current information about events and school activities in our community. A MacFarlane Park IB Parent Handbook was created to assist parents in understanding our school culture, history and the IB Program. Parents and community representatives often are guest speakers, bringing current events both locally and internationally to the classroom.

Parent engagement is an essential part of the MacFarlane Park School community. Parents enjoy meeting for morning coffee in the cafeteria, play groups at the playground, community sporting events together, monthly socials to meet other parents and become a part of our dynamic school family. MacFarlane Park PTA and MacFarlane Park IB World School have been designated as a 2014–2018 National PTA School of Excellence! As a National PTA School of Excellence, families feel welcomed and empowered to support student success, and PTA is a key partner for continuous school improvement. Our PTA and school continuously work to identify new ways to engage families in school decision-making, such as improvements to programs, practices and policies related to education, health, safety or the arts.

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: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00