Memorial Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Memorial Middle School

4702 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: April Gillyard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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

Memorial Middle School

4702 N CENTRAL AVE, Tampa, FL 33603

[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	92%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	D

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.

The faculty and staff of Memorial Middle School will collaboratively use every available resource to foster an environment of high expectations which supports the physiological, social, emotional, and academic needs of every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We support the District's vision of Preparing Students for Life, and are working to ensure that our students leave our school equipped with the tools they need to graduate on time. Our District's graduation rate goal is 90% by 2020. With that in mind, we have developed the following Vision for our school:

Working together to prepare students for 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
Gillyard, April	Principal	
Robinson, Tehia	Assistant Principal	
Mertens, Jane	Instructional Coach	
Weaver, William	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, April Gillyard

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.*
3

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
36

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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (38%)
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	190	227	230	0	0	0	0	647
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	88	67	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	70	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	24	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	91	54	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	93	71	0	0	0	0	223

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
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

Friday 9/11/2020

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	280	192	236	0	0	0	0	708
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	39	50	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	9	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	17	54	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	23	11	23	0	0	0	0	57

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	28	22	32	0	0	0	0	82

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	280	192	236	0	0	0	0	708
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	39	50	0	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	9	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	17	54	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	23	11	23	0	0	0	0	57

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	28	22	32	0	0	0	0	82

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	34%	51%	54%	29%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	52%	54%	39%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	47%	30%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	39%	55%	58%	28%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	57%	57%	45%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	52%	51%	43%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	24%	47%	51%	27%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	42%	67%	72%	48%	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	36%	53%	-17%	54%	-18%
	2018	25%	52%	-27%	52%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	26%	54%	-28%	52%	-26%
	2018	27%	52%	-25%	51%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	32%	53%	-21%	56%	-24%
	2018	28%	54%	-26%	58%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	28%	49%	-21%	55%	-27%
	2018	19%	48%	-29%	52%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	38%	62%	-24%	54%	-16%
	2018	35%	61%	-26%	54%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
08	2019	33%	31%	2%	46%	-13%
	2018	18%	29%	-11%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	22%	47%	-25%	48%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	18%	48%	-30%	50%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	36%	67%	-31%	71%	-35%
2018	34%	65%	-31%	71%	-37%
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	85%	63%	22%	61%	24%
2018	78%	63%	15%	62%	16%
Compare		7%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	56%	-56%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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	10	32	31	10	39	54	3	17			
ELL	21	48	52	31	61	68	11	30	54		

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
ASN	67	77		75	77						
BLK	25	37	30	29	48	61	18	33	45		
HSP	34	49	49	39	61	64	24	43	64		
WHT	42	57	33	46	53	40	27	52			
FRL	33	47	44	38	58	62	23	41	66		

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	6	42	49	9	35	33	8	10			
ELL	15	45	49	19	46	53	12	22	67		
ASN	47	60		67	73						
BLK	21	53	68	24	42	60	5	32			
HSP	31	51	56	31	49	53	24	38	68		
MUL	23			46	36						
WHT	49	51		37	54	64	27	47			
FRL	31	50	52	31	49	55	21	38	69		

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	10	27	16	9	42	43	4	21			
ELL	23	42	33	19	42	38	13	42	83		
ASN	63	81		75	71						
BLK	12	21	21	12	38	50	13	38	54		
HSP	32	42	31	30	46	41	31	50	81		
WHT	36	47		39	48		18	50			
FRL	28	39	31	27	44	43	26	48	67		

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	490
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	45
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	74
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	
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	
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	44
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.

Civics and Science were well below any acceptable level for the 2018-19 school year. These two areas will be addressed during the 2020-2021 school year. In addition, the ELA and Math proficiency are areas of concern that will be addressed also. Some of the contributing factors to the low performance were student attendance (only 74% of students had attendance above 90%), low student self-efficacy, and lack of teacher understanding of standards and best strategies to use with struggling students.

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

The two components that had the greatest decline were science and civics. Some of the contributing factors were student attendance, teacher expertise in subject matter, lack of experienced teacher in the science classrooms. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, our students are coming back to school with a significant learning gap.

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.

We did not test in 2020, however, the civics EOC has the largest gap compared to the state. Student attendance, teacher expertise in subject matter, and change of teachers.

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

The bottom quartile in ELA and math made tremendous gains. Every student had a reading course, pulled small groups, and targeted literacy instruction in ESOL classes.

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

Attendance will be the main focus for the 2020-2021 school year and closing the learning gap due to not being in school for 6 months.

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

1. Teacher Clarity
2. Assessment capable learners
3. Feedback
4. Progress monitoring
5. Restorative Practices-School culture & PBIS

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	All stakeholders will contribute to improving teacher clarity and making assessment capable learners. There needs to be more explicit planning on how to communicate the learning intentions and success criteria to the students. There is a need for more development of pedagogical knowledge of Civics and Science standards. Needs to be better progress monitoring data in order to have a more frequent assessment of how students are performing in class.
Measurable Outcome:	2018 - Civics 34% Science 20% 2019- Civics 36% Science 22% 2021- Civics 60% Science 40% Our goal is to reach 60% proficiency on the Civics EOC and Science 40% proficiency for the school year 2021. Also, improve the students' ability to think critically and problem-solve across all content areas. Additional focus on the ESSA subgroups below 41% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jane Mertens (jane.mertens@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Weekly planning meetings with an instructional coach for each teacher 2. Ongoing coaching and feedback 3. Ongoing progress monitoring and informal assessments (daily checks for understanding) 4. Purposeful use of technology-based programs, equipment for student engagement 5. Small group instruction and tutorial sessions focused on ESSA subgroups under 41%.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. To utilize data regularly to help plan instruction 2. Deepen teacher's understanding of how to communicate the learning intentions and success criteria 3. Provide engagement opportunities with the use of technology 4. Support the development of high quality lesson plans and the purposeful use of technology to enhance engagement

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be actively participating in collaborative structures designed
by the teacher to foster discussion and questioning skills. We want to build
teacher capacity to develop engaging lessons that impact student outcomes.
Teachers will meet weekly with an instructional planning coach.
Administration will conduct walkthroughs and give feedback and review
coaching logs.
2.Teachers will be trained on how to communicate the learning intention and success criteria to the
students.
So they know what they are learning and how they know they learned it. We will also conduct site based
PD, district PD, book studies, and conferences. We want teachers
to be equipped with the strategies to engage students in meaningful lessons.
We will offer training monthly and as needed throughout the school year.
Administration will monitor the implementation and professional
development logs.
3. We will purchase interactive whiteboard projectors (brightlink) for all
classrooms. We want to increase student and teacher engagement and

interaction with the lessons. This interaction will occur daily and it will be monitored by administration and instructional coaches.
4. Instructional coaches will meet weekly with individual teachers to help
teacher effectively communicate the learning intentions to students.

Person Responsible   William Weaver (william.weaver@hcps.net)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Some of the other school-wide areas of focus are PBIS, morning and afternoon tutorial programs, summer academic enrichment programs, SEL programs, training on Visible Learning Strategies, and other academic field trips that will enhance the classroom experience for the students. Based on the student survey, teacher ASQi survey, and student achievement data; there is a need for systems and structures to be in place to address school-wide culture and student achievement.
School culture includes working with the teachers and student services department to design structures for students dealing with trauma, grief, and homelessness. Also, train teachers how to deal with students coming from diverse backgrounds and trauma. We will implement mentor programs. We will have on-going professional development on using restorative practices and trauma informed classroom strategies daily.

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 will hold monthly parent meetings at the end of our SAC meeting. These meetings will consist of parent engagement and involvement strategies along with how to help their child at home. These meetings will be focused on how parents can help their child navigate through school. We already have several community partnerships that are serving our students and families. We have a food pantry and clothes closet on campus for our families to access as needed throughout the school year. We will give the parents an initial survey at the beginning of the year to determine their needs and how we can help fulfill their needs at home and school. We will have four conference nights so the families can engage with our teachers in order to have a clear picture of how their child is doing in school.
Our goal is to partner with our parents so they feel like they have a voice in the decisions made at the school.

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: Professional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00