Reddick Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Reddick Elementary School

325 W LAKE DR, Wimauma, FL 33598

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Aliya Norman

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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

Reddick Elementary School

325 W LAKE DR, Wimauma, FL 33598

[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 PK-5	Yes	93%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	94%

School Grades History

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

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.

Raise the bar;
Accelerate Learning;
Youth of today, leaders of tomorrow;
Strive for excellence

Provide the school's vision statement.

Reddick Rays will EMPOWER one another to be their best.

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
Roth, J. Thomas	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/25/2020, Aliya Norman

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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
63

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (32%)
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	114	120	121	123	139	136	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	753
Attendance below 90 percent	25	24	24	23	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	23	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	16	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	3	9	12	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	114	153	153	170	135	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	17	19	21	21	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	74	41	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	1	0	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	8	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	114	153	153	170	135	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	17	19	21	21	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	74	41	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	1	0	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	8	1	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
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	32%	52%	57%	29%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	49%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	50%	53%	55%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	54%	63%	42%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	57%	62%	58%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	46%	51%	51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	32%	50%	53%	26%	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	23%	52%	-29%	58%	-35%	
	2018	33%	53%	-20%	57%	-24%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%	
	2018	24%	55%	-31%	56%	-32%	
Same Grade Comparison		17%					
Cohort Comparison		8%					
05	2019	36%	54%	-18%	56%	-20%	
	2018	35%	51%	-16%	55%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison		12%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	44%	54%	-10%	62%	-18%	
	2018	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	36%	57%	-21%	64%	-28%	
	2018	28%	57%	-29%	62%	-34%	
Same Grade Comparison		8%					
Cohort Comparison		-6%					
05	2019	52%	54%	-2%	60%	-8%	
	2018	56%	54%	2%	61%	-5%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		24%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	31%	51%	-20%	53%	-22%	

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	52%	-14%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison	-7%					
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	12	44	50	22	46	57	5				
ELL	25	55	56	38	55	56	16				
BLK	30	47		44	53						
HSP	31	57	59	43	58	57	30				
WHT	52	75		67	57		45				
FRL	30	56	59	43	56	55	28				
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	9	32	36	15	16	18	17				
ELL	22	29	39	32	36	39	20				
BLK	37	47		48	74		43				
HSP	29	38	41	42	44	40	37				
WHT	40	39		42	30		50				
FRL	28	37	44	40	43	37	38				
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	11	43	39	21	39	28	15				
ELL	16	42	55	33	49	42	6				
BLK	28	31		44	56		50				
HSP	27	49	57	40	57	51	21				
WHT	39	53		50	68						
FRL	27	48	55	41	59	51	26				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	46
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
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	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 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	59
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.

According to our 2018-2019 FSA data, ELA gains are 32% proficiency, gaining only 1%. Contributing to last years low performances are our students entering without prior background knowledge and English as a second language. Students continue to under perform in primary grades which leads to low proficiency levels in the intermediate grades.

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

According to our 2018-2019 FSA data, the greatest decline proficiency is Science. Gains declined 8%. Contributing factors consist of low proficiency in nonfiction reading texts, science vocabulary, lack of background Science knowledge and English as a second language.

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.

In the area of ELA the state scored 56% proficiency while Reddick scored 32%. Students came in below proficiency lacking fundamental skills and background knowledge.

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

According to our 2018-2019 FSA data, our gains scores showed the most improvement in ELA and Math. With gains in ELA overall 59% and Math 58% gains. We utilized Reading and Math coaches in planning standards and instructional support and methods.

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

1. 165 students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 on FSA.
2. 102 students were below 90% with attendance.

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

1. Differentiate instruction and content to meet the needs of all levels of learners.
2. Increase the amount of Cross Curricular used in instruction.
3. Increase students positive behavior school wide.
4. Continue learning, support and monitoring of ELA trends.
5. Increase students attendance rates/ percentages.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Using our data for all curriculum and levels of learning, especially focusing on our ESSA SWD subgroup, we will strengthen our instructional practice through collaboration so that we can raise our students engagement to meet the needs of all levels of learning. Reddick Elementary will also build teacher capacity to use cross curricular instruction along with differentiation to help meet the needs of learners across all levels.
Measurable Outcome:	1. We will increase or ELA proficiency by 5%. 2. We will increase our Math proficiency by 5%. 3. We will increase our Science proficiency by 5%. 4. We will increase our ESSA SWD scores by 6%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	J. Thomas Roth (j.roth@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional and standards based planning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are not always given the opportunity to engage in rigorous tasks aligned with the state standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional and standards based planning.
- Specific focus on ESSA SWD.
-Bi-weekly scheduled facilitated planning sessions by resource and academic coaches.
-Planning and instruction for differentiation across all learning levels.
-Creating rigorous tasks that match the levels of the standards.
-Creating assessments and criteria that match standards.
- Tying in ELA standard based planning into other curricular areas.
-Incorporate ELA standards into Science standard based planning and instruction.
-Incorporate ELA standards into Math standard based planning and instruction.
-PD on cross curricular instruction.
-PD on differentiation instruction and planning.
-Coaching cycles with resource and academic coaches, as needed.
After school tutoring to specific students at varied levels in specific academic areas.

Person Responsible   J. Thomas Roth (j.roth@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reddick Elementary has 102 students with attendance rates below 90%. Reddick Elementary has 5 students with 2 or more suspensions. Both of these indicators are a huge impact on school culture, student behaviors and student learning. We will focus on identifying how we can bring the attendance rates up and suspensions down.
Measurable Outcome:	Reddick Elementary will reduce the number of students below 90% attendance rate to 80. The number of students with 2 or more suspensions will decrease to 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	J. Thomas Roth (j.roth@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing a conscious discipline system school wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are not always aware of how to self advocate in a positive and/ or productive way.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a stakeholder team utilizing the Parent Liaison as well as the Behavior Specialist to support positive behaviors on school campus.
- Utilize PD to train staff with resources to help them teach students how to express themselves in a positive manner.
-Organize monthly school-wide positive behavior events.
-Schedule weekly SEL meetings with each classroom instructor, facilitated by the Social Worker, Guidance, Behavior Specialist and School Psychologist.
-Schedule parent training's to help to support student behaviors at home.Our Social Worker will choose a student , weekly to highlight on the morning show.
-Create classroom based incentives for every classroom.
Create a school wide store to engage students in positive incentives.

Person Responsible	J. Thomas Roth (j.roth@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.

N/A

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.

See attached PFEP for a description of our mission and how we plan to build relationships with parents, families, and other community members,

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

The School Board of each Florida district is required by state law to establish a comprehensive program for student progression that is based on an evaluation of each student's performance including an assessment of how well the student masters the performance standards approved by the state board. The district's program for student progression is based on mastery of the English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies standards. (F.S. 1008.25)

The HCPS Student Progression Plan includes information on initial placement, reporting student progress, reading remediation, academic acceleration, grade promotion and retention, graduation requirements, transfer credits, student recognition, accommodations, dual enrollment, and extended learning opportunities.

For complete information, please visit our Student Progression Plan at: http://www.sdhc.k12.fl.us/docs/00/00/21/33/studentprogressionplan.pdf

HCPS utilizes a variety of strategies for assisting students as they transition from one school to another.

HCPS employs multiple strategies for preparing children for entry into kindergarten. Over 6,000 children participate in one of several preschool programs offered by the School District (Head Start, VPK and PreK-ESE). Developmental screenings are available for all families prior to entry into kindergarten through Child Find, a service within the Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). Additionally, the district works closely with School Readiness providers to share information.

HCPS utilizes multiple strategies for preparing students for their next school, including transitioning from elementary to middle school, middle school to high school, or simply moving to a new school mid-year. Examples include:

Bring 6th/9th graders back early for orientation
Train a cadre of student ambassadors to help orient other students
Parent information and/or education opportunities

Hold articulation meetings between 5th and 6th grade teachers
Campus visits
Shadow days
Middle school students visit, tutor and or perform at elementary schools
High school students visit, tutor, or perform at middle schools.
HCPS strategies to advance college and career awareness include: Career interest inventory offered to students through Florida Shines; District College Nights; District Financial Aid Nights; Postsecondary representative visits at high schools; Fieldtrip opportunities for career awareness; Fieldtrip opportunities to technical colleges; and Opportunities for students to take courses within their area of interest at their high school, via virtual school, and through dual enrollment.

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: Student Engagement	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00