Mulrennan Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mulrennan Middle School

4215 DURANT RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tamara Brooks

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
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 (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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

Mulrennan Middle School

4215 DURANT RD, Valrico, FL 33596

[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	No	50%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

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.

To build positive relationships with our students, staff and community while providing a safe, caring and academically challenging environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To have a successful middle school experience by providing a place to excel.

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
Ducker, Tim	Principal	
Rodgers, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Hernandez, Rosa	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/2/2020, Tamara Brooks

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.*
21

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
73

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
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 (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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	373	412	446	0	0	0	0	1231
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	82	88	0	0	0	0	229
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	5	0	0	0	0	28
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	0	0	55	43	62	0	0	0	0	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	46	43	0	0	0	0	156

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	4	9	3	0	0	0	0	16

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	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	13
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	441	451	456	0	0	0	0	1348
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	21	36	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	47	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	86	101	0	0	0	0	249
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	53	77	0	0	0	0	182

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	22	29	38	0	0	0	0	89

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	

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	441	451	456	0	0	0	0	1348
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	21	36	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	26	47	0	0	0	0	99
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	86	101	0	0	0	0	249
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	53	77	0	0	0	0	182

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	22	29	38	0	0	0	0	89

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	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	12
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	63%	51%	54%	63%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	52%	54%	61%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	47%	47%	42%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	70%	55%	58%	66%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	66%	57%	57%	61%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	51%	45%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	54%	47%	51%	57%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	67%	72%	82%	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	64%	53%	11%	54%	10%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	64%	54%	10%	52%	12%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	51%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
08	2019	57%	53%	4%	56%	1%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	58%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	73%	49%	24%	55%	18%
	2018	64%	48%	16%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	70%	62%	8%	54%	16%
	2018	71%	61%	10%	54%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	15%	31%	-16%	46%	-31%
	2018	26%	29%	-3%	45%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	54%	47%	7%	48%	6%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	59%	48%	11%	50%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	79%	67%	12%	71%	8%
2018	77%	65%	12%	71%	6%
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	86%	63%	23%	62%	24%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC

Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	57%	43%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
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	19	34	34	23	45	41	12	46			
ELL	22	47	44	31	57	55	8	40			

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	81	55		83	70		58	80	90		
BLK	51	53	49	50	59	57	42	73	70		
HSP	56	56	47	63	64	51	52	73	85		
MUL	60	54	33	69	75	71	46	76	75		
WHT	69	57	39	76	66	52	60	87	87		
FRL	51	50	41	55	58	51	45	70	75		

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	24	38	36	24	33	22	22	48	71		
ELL	19	41	38	29	44	40	23	49	80		
ASN	81	59		83	71		67	90	93		
BLK	55	62	48	54	53	31	44	78	58		
HSP	56	59	48	58	57	44	46	72	85		
MUL	63	53	36	65	52	38	65	62	82		
WHT	74	67	53	75	67	50	69	80	90		
FRL	54	57	44	55	54	42	47	68	77		

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	19	34	27	22	36	30	12	50			
ELL	14	33	35	27	39	30	9	56			
ASN	81	68		81	84		55	93	100		
BLK	40	46	32	44	57	46	23	61	70		
HSP	56	61	44	55	52	33	48	78	83		
MUL	77	60	40	77	67	45	78	88	100		
WHT	70	64	48	76	65	55	68	88	86		
FRL	51	53	35	52	53	38	40	73	74		

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	64
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	641
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	42
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	56
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	62
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	62
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	66
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	57
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.

8th grade ELA decreased 11 points: 8th grade Math decreased 56 points; Science decreased 5 points.

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

Our bottom quartile dropped from 50 to 42 in ELA. Science dropped from 60 to 54. The overall drop in ELA was 3 points.

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 decreased 31 percentage points from the state average.

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

6th grade increased 18% for 2019 compared to state but school compared to state was up 9%.

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

ELA bottom quartile

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

1. Data driven PLC's
2. Student Engagement
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will engage in structured PLC's. This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the ELA and Algebra EOC data results.
Measurable Outcome:	The number of Mulrennan students making learning gains points for ELA will increase from 63% to 65 % or higher in 2021 and for Algebra EOC from 85% to 87% % or higher. Science achievement points will increase from 54% to 56% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Ducker (tim.ducker@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Structured data driven PLC's.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work collaboratively in their PLC's to ensure all lessons are standards based and that specific target standards have been identified. Student data will be dis-aggregated and student needs will be identified based on common assessment results data. All students will be included and teachers will progress monitor and differentiate instruction according to individual student needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC's will meet weekly
2. They will follow the PLC cycle (Plan-Do-Check-Act).
3.Administrators and subject area leaders will work with departments and provide easy to follow PLC forms to help guide teachers through the cycle as they plan and collaborate.
4. Teachers will provide copies of their PLC logs to assistant principal (M. Braglin) and to their subject area leader for review and feedback.

Person Responsible	Tim Ducker (tim.ducker@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus was identified as a critical need based on the ELA and Math FSA 2019 data results. (No FSA testing for Spring of 2020).
Measurable Outcome:	The number of Mulrennan students making learning gains points for ELA will increase from 63% to 65% or higher in 2021 and for Algebra EOC from 85% to 87% or higher. Science achievement points will increase from 54% to 56% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Ducker (tim.ducker@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional personnel will adapt current student engagement strategies from Kagan and Jim Burke to a more individualized student focus (during the pandemic-covid-19 learning phase).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students must take ownership of their learning in order to realize their potential and achieve success. Teachers must create a learning environment that is engaging and aligned to students' needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Make important data visible: Students will turn in assignments daily/weekly in order to demonstrate their knowledge level and teachers will utilize this data to drive instruction.
2. E-learning teaches will provide "model" student learning behaviors as they focus attention to positive behaviors demonstrated by individual E-learning students thus setting data informed goals.
3. Teachers will celebrate quick wins by celebrating hard work and focused on-task behaviors.
4. Identifying effective practices and repeating those "data-driven" behaviors, adapting as needed throughout the pandemic.

Person Responsible	Tim Ducker (tim.ducker@hcps.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our students with disabilities subgroup scored below 41% achievement according to current year data.
Measurable Outcome:	42% of students with disabilities will score proficient on state testing.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tim Ducker (tim.ducker@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Individualized reading instruction utilizing BrightFish for levels 1 and 2 ELA. Math excel is being utilized also during learning strategies time.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing resources available to engage students through technology which is proven to raise achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use Brighfish in Reading classes
2. Use Math Excel in Math
3. Targeted interventions through learning strategies courses for most high needs students.

Person Responsible	Tim Ducker (tim.ducker@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School will focus efforts on building relationships with students and stakeholders as well as building cultural awareness.

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 holds events in which parents and care-givers are encouraged to attend (prior to Covid-19 pandemic) such as:
Open house for all sixth graders (limited to incoming sixth graders so they are able to experience the campus for the first time without all the extra crowds for other grade levels).
Open house for 7th and 8th graders and their families
Quarterly conference nights
PTSA sponsored events
Chorus and Band/Orchestra concerts
AVID events
Grade level incentives (field trips, awards, honor roll celebrations)
Currently we post announcements to all Canvas courses
Send parent link phone calls to notify all stakeholders

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 Communities**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00