

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Williams Middle Magnet School



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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Williams Middle Magnet School

5020 N 47TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Dante Jones

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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)	47%
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 (80%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (78%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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	18

Williams Middle Magnet School

5020 N 47TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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	48%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	78%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We encourage students to aspire to engage in academic rigor as they pursue knowledge and skills to be lifelong learners. Students aspire to achieve balance between educational excellence and personal strengths and interests. The Williams community supports the development of responsible open-minded students who, as members of the global community, appreciate the diversity of the world in which they live.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Williams IB Middle Years Programme aims to provide a challenging international education that empowers students to become knowledgeable, caring and engaged global scholars who make positive contributions in the world around them

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
Blackwood-Green, Shellie	Principal	
Dutzar, Monica	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Social Studies
Weg, Kristy	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Science
Menendez, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Mathematics
Coulsey, Kalena	Teacher, K-12	Subject Area Leader - Language Arts
Juan, Celeste	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Dante Jones

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

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)	47%
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 (80%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (78%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	305	261	262	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	25	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
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	14	25	7	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	4	0	0	0	0	61

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	83%	51%	54%	80%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	52%	54%	67%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	47%	47%	51%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	87%	55%	58%	83%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	75%	57%	57%	74%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	52%	51%	56%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	79%	47%	51%	77%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	67%	72%	94%	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	80%	53%	27%	54%	26%
	2018	84%	52%	32%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	88%	54%	34%	52%	36%
	2018	80%	52%	28%	51%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	82%	53%	29%	56%	26%
	2018	83%	54%	29%	58%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	83%	49%	34%	55%	28%
	2018	88%	48%	40%	52%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	91%	62%	29%	54%	37%
	2018	87%	61%	26%	54%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	44%	31%	13%	46%	-2%
	2018	16%	29%	-13%	45%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		28%				
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	80%	47%	33%	48%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	78%	48%	30%	50%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	94%	67%	27%	71%	23%
2018	89%	65%	24%	71%	18%
Compare		5%			
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	95%	63%	32%	61%	34%
2018	94%	63%	31%	62%	32%
Compare		1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	57%	41%	57%	41%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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	68	74	67	55	64	72		91			

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
ELL	54	63	63	59	69	60		100			
ASN	93	72	65	98	83	78	90	97	99		
BLK	70	61	62	79	69	69	62	88	91		
HSP	81	66	60	82	74	68	72	96	95		
MUL	93	70	73	88	73	62	94	100	89		
WHT	92	77	86	93	79	84	91	98	96		
FRL	72	65	66	76	67	70	62	88	91		
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	47	59	39	53	53	33	25	25			
ELL	39	52	49	55	54	38	13	59			
ASN	97	86	90	100	86	75	99	96	100		
BLK	69	62	55	73	63	53	54	80	80		
HSP	73	62	53	82	71	65	56	83	93		
MUL	90	81		92	71		100	94	100		
WHT	89	72	71	95	77	75	90	92	95		
FRL	67	62	53	74	66	53	52	80	84		
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	29	42	32	33	54	39					
ELL	31	34	29	46	58	58		75			
ASN	96	80	67	98	87	78	98	100	100		
BLK	64	57	48	64	61	50	54	83	79		
HSP	69	64	43	78	67	62	67	91	91		
MUL	91	68		89	79		69	100	100		
WHT	86	67	63	90	76	52	85	98	92		
FRL	64	55	43	66	64	56	57	84	82		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	92
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	809

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	70
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	70
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	86
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	72
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	77
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	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	88
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	75
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.

Due to COVID-19, we have no assessment results for last year. 6th grade ELA achievement decreased from 85% in 2018 to 80% proficiency in 2019. These results are not a trend. Sixth grade ELA students performed 27% above the district.

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

Due to COVID-19, we have no assessment results for last year. 6th grade math achievement decreased from 88% in 2018 to 83% proficiency in 2019. These results are not a trend. Sixth grade math students performed 34% above the district.

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.

Due to COVID-19, we have no assessment results for last year. However, in the previous year, all grade level achievement data results were greater than the state average.

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

Due to COVID-19, we have no assessment results for last year. In 2019 7th grade showed the greatest increase with 8% improvement from 2018. There are not enough data to determine if this is a trend. Historically, Williams students outscore their counterparts in other district schools.

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

Fortunately, the EWS data provided by the district show no potential areas of concern. COVID-19 has brought its own unique stressors, and we are dealing with both those and the unique challenges of virtual learning as a school community.

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

1. Social-Emotional Learning
2. Reflection as a form of assessment (IB Learner Profile)
3. Assessment and Feedback
4. Differentiation of Instruction

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Area of Focus identified is Assessment and Feedback. This Area of Focus is aligned with the IB programme requirements. In addition, it is a continuance of last school year's area of focus, Reflection as a form of assessment. The rationale, is that 70 % of our students are eLearning and 30 % are on-site. Meaning that our teachers are having to create effective and innovative ways to assess student learning and provide them feedback and to drive instruction. In addition, our school had an IB evaluation the week of 9/30 and that was identified by the evaluators as an area of improvement.

Measurable Outcome: All students were required to take a district-wide base line assessments(Writing, reading, math and civics).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shellie Blackwood-Green (shellie.blackwood-green@hcps.net)

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.

The 6th grade team will support Social-Emotional Learning through the implementation of "Second Step" program lessons in the core content areas.

The ELA, social studies, and science departments will support differentiated instruction through the implementation of the Achieve 3000 program and the Instructional Framework at all grade levels.

Teachers will continue to meet with colleagues in grade level PLCs within subject areas to support assessment, ensuring rubrics and other measurement tools are fairly and consistently applied among the different classes.

All core subject and elective classes will continue to support reflection by encouraging students to process their learning, make connections, set goals, identify needs and recognize areas of strength. Reflection in one of those forms will continue to be a regular part of each lesson.

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.

Williams Middle Magnet School is proud to be an International Baccalaureate (IB) Middle Years Programme site. As such, social and emotional well-being is a priority of both the conceptual design of our curricular program and our way of work. The foundation of the IB program rests upon a learner-centered approach with an inquiry-driven focus, extensive collaboration among students, and involvement with the broader school and local community. With its emphasis on global contexts, the emphasis on community extends to the international community.

One of the most significant parts of the IB program, and one that strongly impacts our schools positive culture and environment, is the IB Learner Profile. Made up of ten attributes, the Learner Profile is a shared vocabulary and way of work that is introduced to students from the time they begin the IB program and remains a constant throughout their time with us. Attributes that particularly relate to well-being include balanced, risk-taker, caring, open-minded, knowledgeable, and reflective. Remaining true to these principles fosters a safe and happy environment in which young people can learn and a welcoming place for stakeholders to visit.

Although we are experiencing challenges in hosting face-to-face interactions with internal and external stakeholders at this time, due to precautions related to COVID-19, Williams Middle Magnet School prides

itself on its family atmosphere, both within our internal school family of students and school staff, as well as by extension to the families of our students. We host opportunities for families to visit our school for such events as "Family Fun Night" and encourage them to get involved in events in the larger community, such as the book drive sponsored last year by the Temple Terrace Public Library. Service is a huge part of the IB program, and students have the opportunity, beginning in 6th grade, to take part in community service events like the "Coastal Cleanup."

Our challenge now is to keep our stakeholders as involved as possible within the constraints imposed by COVID-19. Since we are knowledgeable, caring, reflective, risk-takers, we feel confident we will meet that challenge.

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
Total:			\$0.00