Academy For International Education Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Academy For International Education Charter School

1080 LABARON DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

http://www.aiecharter.net

Demographics

Principal: Yaquelin Ricardo

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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

N/A

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

Academy For International Education Charter School

1080 LABARON DR, Miami Springs, FL 33166

http://www.aiecharter.net

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 KG-5	Yes	94%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	96%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

The mission of Academy for International Education is to create student-leaders who are empowered by challenging academic experiences while solving real-world problems in a culture of innovation and collaboration. Our students think critically, discover relentlessly, and act ethically, in service of humanity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AIE will immerse its students in science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics (STEAM) as a way of seeking facts and making sense of the world around them. At AIE learning is focused on active exploration of major concepts, ideas and theories through hands-on learning and real-life problem solving. Students will be challenged to use scientific knowledge and critical thinking skills as they take ownership of their personal academic exploration and growth.

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
Hirsh, Vera	Other	Mrs. Vera Hirsh, Head of Schools works with team members to identify student and staff needs. Collaborates with team members in problem-solving and planning. Ensures that all leadership members attend the Leadership Weekly Meetings in order to discuss school's concerns, budget, expenses, technology, security, software usage, staff deployment, purchase orders, etc. Vera Hirsh makes sure that the implementation of the RAPTOR and school security is in place and its implemented with fidelity. Allocates resources to meet the needs of all teachers, students, and staff. Understands and ensures the integration and implementation of goals, action plans, data, and practices. Ensures communication of information. Plans the involvement of families and community regarding school-wide goals and activities.
Ricardo, Yaquelin	Principal	Mrs. Ricardo ensures that teachers work in collaboration and set high expectations for all students to close the achievement gap between advantaged and less advantaged students. Implements and schedules MTSS/ RTI. Monitors school attendance. Makes decisions for the use of data driven instruction. Meets with parents, teachers, and staff regarding academics, data, and activities for the continuous improvement. Plans Professional Development and supports classroom instruction by modeling lessons. Shares a common goal of improving instruction for all students. Collects, analyzes, and shares data.
Bertrand, Megan	Assistant Principal	Ms. Megan Bertrand provides instructional support and guidance to staff in the areas of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). Ms. Bertrand works with the leadership team to insure STEM curriculum integration is taking place in all content areas. She is also responsible for making sure that AIE's practices align with MDCPS STEM designation requirements to ensure the school receives a STEM designation from the district. provide support to teachers, parents, and students regarding student behavior and discipline. Works with team members to provide support and meets the needs of students, parents, and staff.
Camji, Carlos	Teacher, ESE	Carlos Camji, Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teacher, collaborates with general education teachers to plan activities and accommodate students' IEP. Mr. Camji assists with MTSS/RTI TIER 3 implementation and data collection. In addition, he works in collaboration with teachers to monitor students' progress. Mr. Camji meets with other professionals such as Psychologists, Speech Pathologists, Social Workers, and other agencies in order to revise, update, and evaluate student's IEP's.
Canelo, Dorremi	School Counselor	Dorremi Canelo and Margarita Avalos plan and implement an anti-bullying program. They meet with students for individual and group counseling. Ms. canelo implements a school wide character education program. She also implements the Do the Right Thing Program (DTRT). In addition, both counselors provide support to teachers and administrators to make sure students and parents are aware of the importance of attendance. Both recognize students, parents, and teachers who cooperate and participate in school's activities.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gonzalez, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chairs and Instructional Support: Ivette Casal Jennifer Matus Kelly Gonzalez Catherine Curbelo Amanda Dean Grade Level Chairs and Instructional Support Personnel share a common goal of improving teaching and learning. Communicate and collaborate with administrators and staff to inform, share, and assist with the problem solving process. Participate and assist with data analysis, best practices, and resources implementation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/1/2019, Yaquelin Ricardo

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

24

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2022-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	0%

2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	57	53	62	71	61	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	378
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Friday 9/11/2020

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	52	58	69	59	60	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
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	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	52	58	69	59	60	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
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	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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%	62%	57%	62%	57%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	62%	58%	61%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	58%	53%	56%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	69%	63%	62%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	66%	62%	47%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	55%	51%	35%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	55%	53%	47%	52%	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	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
	2018	58%	61%	-3%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	58%	5%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	60%	-6%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		31%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	67%	5%	62%	10%
	2018	84%	67%	17%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	69%	7%	64%	12%
	2018	60%	68%	-8%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	67%	65%	2%	60%	7%
	2018	61%	66%	-5%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	46%	53%	-7%	53%	-7%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	28	59	82	44	59						
ELL	47	62	61	60	61	65	32	65	100		
HSP	60	62	58	67	60	65	49	77	91		
WHT	61	60		71	52			75			
FRL	56	62	61	63	60	67	43	74	90		

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	32	41		33	47						
ELL	35	43	36	49	53	64	29	36			
HSP	57	48	40	63	56	58	56	58	73		
WHT	52	29		57	57						
FRL	52	44	37	58	54	57	53	50	66		
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	54	54	50	61	43		29				
ELL	36	54	56	48	34	26	21	35			
HSP	63	61	56	63	47	37	48	75	67		
WHT	62	76		62	48		47				
FRL	58	58	52	60	46	33	41	70	65		

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	65
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	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	651
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	62
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	66
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	64
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	64
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.

The data component that shows the lowest performance is Science.
Some contributing factors to THE 2019 test administration's low performance are the following:
1. Limited of Benchmarks instruction in lower grade levels that are needed for students to learn skills by the time
they get to grade 5.
2. Using data to drive instruction.

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

Science is the data component that showed a decline by 8% since all other areas improved.Some factors that contributed to this decline are:
1. Limited of benchmark instruction in lower grades.
2. Students lack of note taking and study skills habit.
3. Data driven -instruction.
4. Students not able to apply the new knowledge learned.

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.

Science is the data component that shows a gap between the state and AIE. There is a
4% gap between AIE and the State.
As mentioned above, benchmarks taught in previous grade levels are needed for students to learn skills and apply the new concepts learned. Using data to drive instruction may have also been a factor that contributed to this trend. Additionally, students lack of study habits and note taking skills may have contributed to this gap. Lastly, students have difficulties applying the new knowledge learned.

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

ELA Learning Gains is the component that showed the most improvement.
Some actions the school took in this area are the following:
1. Providing after school tutoring.
2. Implementing RTI with fidelity.
3. Improving classroom instruction.
4. Use of I-Ready and monitoring student's progress.

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

Two potential areas of concerns are:
1. Science instruction and student's progress.
2. Continue implementing rigorous instruction across grade levels.

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

1. Science instruction and student's academic performance's improvement.
2. Vocabulary knowledge across the grade levels.
3. Implementation of rigorous instruction.
4. Allowing students to become critical thinkers.
5. Monitoring student progress using various data.
6. Increasing literacy across grade levels.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice impacts student learning in many ways. Teacher's implementation of high-quality instruction and application of best practices during daily instruction allow students to perform better, improve academic achievement, and be exposed to innovative ways of learning.
Measurable Outcome:	Data results such as I-Ready, class assessments, topic assessments, and baseline data will allow us to determine and evaluate this area of focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Yaquelin Ricardo (yricardo1@dadeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The implementation of instructional practice and collaborative planning will allow teachers and administrators to analyze data, make instructional decisions, plan, and reflect on teaching and learning. Rigorous instruction will force students to confront misconceptions, reconsider positions, separate the implicit from the explicit, and engage in critical thinking practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use common planning to share ideas, resources, collaborate,and use data to drive instruction. During professional developments, curriculum meetings, and teacher's feedback and reflections, teachers and administrators agree that collaborative planning is an effective strategy to increase academic achievement and teacher development.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct curriculum meetings to review pacing guides, data, student's achievement, and effective strategies to use during instruction.

Person Responsible	Yaquelin Ricardo (yricardo1@dadeschools.net)

Offer professionals development on campus to specifically address teacher's needs based on student's data and the school's goals and focus.

Person Responsible	Yaquelin Ricardo (yricardo1@dadeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Implementing rigorous instruction using the Depth of Knowledge levels of questioning and utilizing data driven instruction in all content areas.

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.

School culture is a key element of school success. AIE Charter Lower School works with teachers, staff, students, and parents to build and foster positive relationships in many ways. For the 2020-2021 school year, we will focus on empowering teachers and staff. We will continue implementing shout-outs for sharing positive recognition and/or accomplishments. During faculty meetings, we will continue to recognize teachers with the "Pioneers Monthly Awards". This award is given to a teacher who had excel, showed leadership, and contributed to
the school culture and overall school performance. Additionally, the Lower School will continue to implement the growth mindset. Students in the past years have been taught the growth mindset through various lessons to build student confidence, increase motivation, and student achievement. Stakeholders will collaborate and give suggestions for continuous improvement. They can recommend best practices and share responsibilities in improving best practices. We will continue to communicate and involve all stakeholders during EESAC meetings, SIP discussions, and parent's meetings.

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: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00