

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Progress Village Middle Magnet



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents	
School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Progress Village Middle Magnet

8113 ZINNIA DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Peter Megara

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

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)	89%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents	
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Progress Village Middle Magnet

8113 ZINNIA DR, Tampa, FL 33619

[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	61%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is "Setting the Stage for Progress with the Spotlight on You!"

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision is to unite students, families, and communities by promoting high academic standards through an arts-integrated learning environment. The focus centers on building interpersonal relationships and achieving excellence in all areas of the curriculum.

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
Megara, Peter	Principal	
Blake, Bridgette	Assistant Principal	
Hildebrand, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
Carlson, Linda	Instructional Coach	
Leavitt, Tyler	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/7/2019, Peter Megara

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

60

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)	89%
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: A (62%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: B (56%)
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	166	128	154	0	0	0	0	448	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	46	62	0	0	0	0	144	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	
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	35	20	48	0	0	0	0	103	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	42	73	0	0	0	0	174	

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	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	

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	60%	51%	54%	60%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	54%	55%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	47%	47%	43%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	55%	58%	62%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	58%	57%	57%	64%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	52%	51%	48%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	55%	47%	51%	43%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	67%	72%	79%	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	59%	53%	6%	54%	5%
	2018	54%	52%	2%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	54%	6%	52%	8%
	2018	60%	52%	8%	51%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	62%	53%	9%	56%	6%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	58%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	46%	49%	-3%	55%	-9%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	70%	62%	8%	54%	16%
	2018	69%	61%	8%	54%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
08	2019	28%	31%	-3%	46%	-18%
	2018	43%	29%	14%	45%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	55%	47%	8%	48%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	48%	8%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	87%	67%	20%	71%	16%
2018	77%	65%	12%	71%	6%
Compare		10%			
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	88%	63%	25%	61%	27%
2018	92%	63%	29%	62%	30%
Compare		-4%			
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	20	39	39	24	39	31	19	48	82		
ELL	39	65	61	40	56	50	23	80			

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	100	92		100	83						
BLK	47	51	44	48	51	42	41	84	82		
HSP	63	59	58	64	63	44	54	86	84		
MUL	67	59	58	65	56	50	56	86	79		
WHT	70	59	56	72	61	51	71	91	91		
FRL	51	54	48	51	53	44	46	81	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	20	37	35	21	43	39	17	41			
ELL	28	44	54	54	62	63		47			
ASN	81	50		100	81						
BLK	43	46	38	55	65	57	33	67	89		
HSP	60	54	48	70	65	60	54	81	87		
MUL	72	49		80	69		64	80	100		
WHT	74	62	50	77	74	61	79	82	85		
FRL	49	48	42	59	65	57	46	68	87		
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	18	37	31	18	39	38	13	48			
ELL	20	37	33	27	50	33		64			
ASN	82	73		82	75						
BLK	45	44	36	48	58	48	19	69	88		
HSP	61	58	46	62	62	40	51	84	95		
MUL	55	49	33	60	66	67	33	72			
WHT	74	64	54	77	70	49	64	88	90		
FRL	51	48	37	53	60	45	32	71	89		

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	62
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	621
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	53
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	94
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	54
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
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
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	69
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.

Math Lowest 25% was the lowest. This was due to teacher changes, including mid-year, a first year teacher, and many teachers working on advanced degrees which may have decreased overall classroom focus and effectiveness.

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

The previously alluded to Math Lowest 25% decreased 13%. The next most significant decline was Math Learning Gains decreasing 10%. The same rationale previously stated applies for this decline.

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.

Math Lowest 25% was -6 when compared with the state. The Math Department has a new TTD and a SAL who is in his 2nd year at PV. They will receive additional support from the Assistant Principal for Administration.

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

Social Studies increased by 10%. The Social Studies TTD was instrumental in increasing achievement in this area. The seventh grade students had received lessons which

incorporated her expertise both in sixth and seventh grade. Also, those teaching Civics were a very strong, highly accomplished group.

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

48 of our current 8th grade students had one or more suspensions in 6th grade.

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

1. SWD Performance
2. Black Student Performance
3. ELL Performance
4. 6th/8th Grade Math
5. 8th Grade ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	African American, ELL, and Students with Disabilities did not make comparable gains in ELA in comparison with their peers.
Measurable Outcome:	This year, we would like to reduce the achievement gap in ELA by 3% for all targeted groups. Within ELA, our school expects to have 87% of all students make learning gains. Within each subgroup, we expect to close the grade level proficiency gap by 3% within each of the targeted groups. African American students are currently at 43% and we expect this group to improve by 3% annually until the gap is closed by 2024 or before. ELL students are currently at 28% and we expect this group to improve by 3% annually until the gap is closed by 2028 or before. Students with Disabilities are currently at 20% and we expect this group to improve by 3% annually until the gap is closed by 2030 or before.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will receive subject-specific support during Professional Learning Community planning meetings. They will collaborate (when possible) while planning to reflect the expectations set forth in the HCPS K-12 Instructional Frameworks. Teachers will then discuss the outcomes of their assessments and next steps based on the data (Plan-Do-Check-Act). This opportunity to participate in on-going self-reflection from data reviews will enable teachers to plan for enrichment and/or remediation. Students will receive this differentiated support through small group rotations as outlined in the HCPS K-12 Instructional Frameworks.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis, collaborative PLCs, and the implementation of the HCPS K-12 Instructional Frameworks leads to specific instructional delivery components that will provide students with the assistance required to increase their skills and capabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Based upon the assessment results, teachers will create groupings designed to ensure the individual needs of each student are met. In addition, students may be referred to a mentoring program or other counseling services where they will receive individual or small group guidance and support. Teachers will increase classroom rigor by utilizing WICOR strategies to ensure student collaboration for cognitive engagement, increase higher order questioning, and participate in a school-wide culture for learning. ELP and Saturday School Tutorial opportunities will be provided to students.

Person Responsible Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Formative assessments will be used to gather data on student understanding in order to further guide instruction. They will also allow teachers to identify misconceptions and allow for flexibility for teachers to provide support. This was identified as a critical need so that students, in addition to teachers, can participate and take ownership in their learning.

Measurable Outcome: We will increase the percentage of students passing the Algebra EOC from 88% to 91% and increase the learning gains of the lowest 25% from 45% to 48%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will receive subject-specific support during Professional Learning Community planning meetings. They will model explicit instruction using learning structures, revisit essential questions, and provide intensive instruction for remediation. Teachers will then discuss the outcomes of their assessments and next steps based on the data (Plan-Do-Check-Act). This opportunity to participate in on-going self-reflection from data reviews will enable teachers to plan for enrichment and/or remediation. Students will receive this differentiated support through small group rotations as outlined in the HCPS K-12 Instructional Frameworks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data analysis, collaborative PLCs, and the implementation of the HCPS K-12 Instructional Frameworks leads to specific instructional delivery components that will provide students with the assistance required to increase their skills and capabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

Based upon the assessment results, teachers will make curriculum based decisions designed to ensure the individual needs of each student are met. This includes reassessing, providing extra practice, and utilizing small groups for enrichment and/or remediation purposes. Teachers will increase classroom rigor by utilizing WICOR strategies to ensure student collaboration for cognitive engagement, increase higher order questioning, and participate in a school-wide culture for learning. ELP, Saturday School, and after school tutorial opportunities will be provided to students.

Person Responsible: Peter Megara (peter.megara@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

African American males performed lower than other subgroups across the board academically. Upon further research into school discipline data, African American males were disciplined at a rate greater than their peers. These are the steps to improve the academic and social success of African American males in the Outcome school setting to promote college and career readiness:

- 1. Identify problematic trends in working with African American males**
- 2. Share results school-wide and identify best practices**
- 3. Support the students through Student Success coaching and peer mentoring/tutoring.**
- 4. Periodically monitor progress through school wide academic and discipline data**
- 5. Interview a select number of students at the beginning of the year and checkpoints throughout the year**
- 6. Teachers, administrators, and students will build relationships to further enhance the school's culture and facilitate greater success.**

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.

PV will build a positive school culture and engage students, staff, and community stakeholders through the following events and activities:

1. AVID Family Nights
2. Iron Sharpens Iron Breakfast
3. SAC & PTSA
4. Elective Parent Boosters
5. Recruitment "Road Shows"
6. PBIS
7. Mentor Program
8. End of Year Musical and Winter Extravaganza
9. HBCU Showcase
10. Back To School Fair
11. GATI
12. Girl Scouts of America Program
13. Shadowing Program for potential students
14. Curriculum Nights
15. STAR Program
16. Colors Club
17. SGA

- 18. Pride Club
- 19. PV's Got Talent
- 20. Multicultural Week
- 21. Start with Hello Week
- 22. Book Club

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00