

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Young 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Young Middle Magnet School

1807 E DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: **Henrissa Berry**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	19

Young Middle Magnet School

1807 E DR MARTIN LUTHER KING JR BLVD, 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	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	98%

School Grades History

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

Young Middle Magnet Creative Science Center will create an equitable environment that enriches the educational experience through, collaboration, diversity, respect and innovation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Young Middle Magnet Creative Science Center will prepare students to become global citizens through an innovative S.T.E.A.M integrated approach.

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
Berry, Henrissa	Principal	School's instructional leader and manages school operations.
Leon, Yasmeeen	SAC Member	SAC Chair, Science SAL
	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Henrissa Berry

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (49%)
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	340	125	100	0	0	0	0	565
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	87	84	0	0	0	0	247
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	5	0	0	0	0	21
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	68	55	63	0	0	0	0	186
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	63	80	0	0	0	0	217

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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	8

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	22	17	9	0	0	0	0	48
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	31	22	0	0	0	0	77

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	225	208	202	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	16	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	51	68	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	71	66	0	0	0	0	213

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	10	21	46	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	225	208	202	0	0	0	0	635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	6
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	20	16	0	0	0	0	67
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	51	68	0	0	0	0	184
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	76	71	66	0	0	0	0	213

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	10	21	46	0	0	0	0	77

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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	36%	51%	54%	35%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	52%	54%	43%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	47%	47%	33%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	32%	55%	58%	43%	54%	56%
Math Learning Gains	42%	57%	57%	52%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	52%	51%	49%	51%	50%
Science Achievement	24%	47%	51%	47%	47%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	40%	67%	72%	47%	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	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
	2018	34%	52%	-18%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	37%	54%	-17%	52%	-15%
	2018	32%	52%	-20%	51%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	34%	53%	-19%	56%	-22%
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	58%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	16%	49%	-33%	55%	-39%
	2018	34%	48%	-14%	52%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	62%	-14%	54%	-6%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	54%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	12%	31%	-19%	46%	-34%
	2018	10%	29%	-19%	45%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	23%	47%	-24%	48%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	48%	-10%	50%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
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	40%	67%	-27%	71%	-31%
2018	41%	65%	-24%	71%	-30%
Compare		-1%			

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	75%	63%	12%	61%	14%
2018	73%	63%	10%	62%	11%
Compare		2%			

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

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	39	34	19	41	51	4	27			
ELL	23	48	53	27	48	46					

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
BLK	29	41	35	25	40	46	20	37	63		
HSP	51	58	54	48	46	50	37	43	80		
MUL	73	47		47	47						
WHT	50	71		50	45		30				
FRL	34	46	40	30	41	47	21	39	68		
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	18	31	33	22	37	19	19	19			
ELL	21	36	36	30	41	36	17	18			
BLK	26	39	44	29	38	32	29	34	69		
HSP	54	58	31	54	55	33	55	63	72		
MUL	57	71		43	43						
WHT	62	56		68	45		72	45	88		
FRL	33	43	44	35	41	32	35	39	68		
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	15	35	32	17	38	32	20	19			
ELL	21	47	44	22	40	31	40	36			
ASN	80	90									
BLK	27	38	30	35	49	50	35	42	84		
HSP	43	46	53	54	53	38	69	55	97		
MUL	62	62		54	62						
WHT	57	57		69	64		81	53	93		
FRL	30	40	31	40	51	47	43	41	90		

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	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	54
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	
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	49
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	41
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.

Sixth grade math went from a 34% pass rate in 2018 to a 16% pass rate in 2019.

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

Sixth grade math went from a 34% pass rate in 2018 to a 16% pass rate in 2019.

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.

Sixth grade math was -18% behind the state in 2018 and -39% behind the state in 2019.

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

Seventh grade math went up from a 41% in 2018 to 48% 2019

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

One potential area of concern is the area of our ELA and Math

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

1. PLC (Academic Discussion): Teachers will meet biweekly on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays with their Subject Area Leaders. The PLC's meetings will be documented and plans will be submitted to the principal. The meetings will carry an instructional focus where standards are targeted, assessment

data and outcomes discussed, and reflected upon with content based data addressing the following questions:

- a) How will we know if they have learned?
- b) What will we do if students don't learn?
- c) What will we do if they already know the content?
- d) What will we do to continue our learning?

2. Engagement through structured student discussions will include a resemblance of the following measures to

facilitate engagement in the classroom which take into effect Hattie's Effect Size of 0.82. The discussions will

be frequent and sustained back and forth dialog which students focus on an academic topic and explore it by

building challenging and negotiating relevant ideas to build new meaning using academic language.

(Zwiers &

Crawford, 2011) teachers will:

- a) Create a comfortable, non-threatening environment.
- b) Get to know their students and the skills and perspectives they bring to the discussions.
- c) Clarify the rules and expectations for discussions at the outset.
- d) Communicate to students the importance of discussion to their success in the course as a whole.
- e) Plan and prepare the discussion.
- f) Accommodate different learning preferences.
- g) Provide a structure with an outline or list of guiding questions on the board before beginning the discussion; ensuring the discussions have a clear beginning, middle, and end.

3. Planning: The Standards - Based Planning Protocol will be used during the school year. The protocol includes

establishing norms for standards based planning and student work analysis. Interactions will include specific

task development and guiding questions including ongoing capacity building and monitoring of implementation.

4. Culture: Our staff, and administration will do the work to develop environments to include the 10 elements of

culture: celebration of Heroes and Heroines; establish Communication Network; identify and practice the

Rites and Rituals of our school; know the Lore and Myths; share Rules, provide Rewards, and Sanctions; and

create Physical Environment that is safe, comfortable and conducive to learning.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Address the decrease in our Reading Performance in three subgroups.

Measurable Outcome:

Students will improve their ability to closely read and understand complex text by increasing FSA scores to include passing by 50 % of the total student population. Students will also be able to organize and transform information from the text. Students will be able to organize and transform information from the text to better allow knowledge transfer across multiple texts, disciplines and content areas

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Henrissa Berry (henrissa.berry@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Through academic discussion: Students will increase comprehension and improve students ability to integrate ideas form multiple sources. Students will be able to extend their knowledge and clarify misunderstandings by having classroom discussions that are student led, organized with clear rules, and maintains academic focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

By addressing academic discussion and organizing & Transforming the texts school wide, students will be equipped with strategies to address decoding issues which usually involve difficulties with sounding out words. Students struggling with reading comprehension may be able to decode what they are reading but may not be able to understand its meaning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The decrease in Math performance in the following subgroups: a) Hispanic Achievement & Proficiency - 6% decrease; b) Black Achievement - 4% decrease; c) White Achievement - 2% decrease.

Measurable Outcome: Students will perform at the 48% to 50% level on Spring FSA exam as a result of the interventions we have planned to put into place.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Henrissa Berry (henrissa.berry@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this area of focus includes school wide incorporation of structured classroom discussions PLC with teachers utilizing this strategy within all classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using academic language has been found to have a Hattie's effect size of 0.82. Utilization of frequent and sustained back and forth dialogues with students focused on academic topics will build challenging and new meaning to concepts by its use (Zwiers & Crawford, 2011)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Following norms and expectations
2. Teachers being prepared for implementation of this strategy through rigorous PLC
3. Use discussion frames and language tools
4. Active listening to others with care in order to paraphrase, synthesize discussion points and to draw conclusions.

Person Responsible: Henrissa Berry (henrissa.berry@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will monitor the data, instruction within the classroom with frequent classroom visits; PLC meetings and meeting documentations, as a means of insuring accountability within this area of focus.

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.

Will will build culture with celebrations of staff and student success', cultivate STEM based norms, and lead students in becoming citizens who practice global planting, global sustainability and global engineering.

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