

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Ferrell Middle Magnet School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Cara Diehl

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ferrell Middle Magnet School

4302 N 24TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">79%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">86%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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 empower our girls to excel in rigorous academics and character education while fostering them to be positive forces in our global community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Developing confident, dynamic, educated young women.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
French, Karen	Principal	Oversees all functions of the school
Cason, Shayla	SAC Member	Student Success Coach SAC Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/10/2021, Cara Diehl

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.*

4

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

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

453

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	126	154	166	0	0	0	0	446
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	31	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	22	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	46	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	26	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	21	37	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	0	24

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/10/2021

2020-21 - 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	155	198	172	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	51	47	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	32	27	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	57	33	0	0	0	0	125

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	11	5	3	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	0	0	0	0	46

2020-21 - 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	155	198	172	0	0	0	0	525
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	51	47	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	32	27	0	0	0	0	82
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	57	33	0	0	0	0	125

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	11	5	3	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	17	0	0	0	0	46

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				53%	51%	54%	48%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	52%	54%	55%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	47%	47%	52%	48%	47%
Math Achievement				62%	55%	58%	63%	56%	58%
Math Learning Gains				72%	57%	57%	73%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75%	52%	51%	66%	52%	51%
Science Achievement				43%	47%	51%	52%	47%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				75%	67%	72%	75%	66%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	51%	53%	-2%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	52%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	54%	53%	1%	56%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	48%	49%	-1%	55%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	65%	62%	3%	54%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	31%	13%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	43%	47%	-4%	48%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	67%	8%	71%	4%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	63%	29%	61%	31%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	90%	57%	33%	57%	33%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

ELA (6-8) Achieve3000 Baseline, Mid-Year, and Summative Data (% Meets/Exceeds Standards)
 Math, Science & Civics Baseline & Mid-Year HCPS assessments (average % correct), Spring Data FSA, SSA, EOC Results

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	23	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	23	50
	Students With Disabilities	40	43	46
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	34	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	44	32
	Students With Disabilities	23	43	20
	English Language Learners	n/a	44	25

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22	28	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	28	31
	Students With Disabilities	32	34	34
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29	41	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	41	42
	Students With Disabilities	31	43	26
	English Language Learners	n/a	38	n/a
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	30	44	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	44	63
	Students With Disabilities	29	43	31
	English Language Learners	27	24	n/a

Grade 8					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		22	31	37
	Economically Disadvantaged		22	33	37
	Students With Disabilities		25	33	36
	English Language Learners		0	0	0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		28	52	57
	Economically Disadvantaged		28	52	54
	Students With Disabilities		32	51	23
	English Language Learners		12	47	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		36	39	32
	Economically Disadvantaged		32	39	28
	Students With Disabilities		43	29	14
	English Language Learners		2	6	n/a
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	11	25	30	13	30	26	14	28			
ELL	42	49	48	37	44	43	21	48			
BLK	41	42	38	35	50	49	23	55	65		
HSP	57	55	49	53	50	36	36	67	75		
MUL	59	59		68	72		27				
WHT	72	65		67	48		67	84	95		
FRL	48	49	43	43	51	48	28	60	70		
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	15	44	47	28	58	74	12	32			
ELL	33	55	59	58	80	82	25	67			
BLK	45	55	55	55	66	76	38	72	88		

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
HSP	52	62	65	67	76	70	47	69	90		
MUL	58	68		58	76						
WHT	74	65	46	76	82	77	58	86	95		
FRL	48	58	57	58	70	74	37	69	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	7	33	33	28	63	52	23	33			
ELL	31	54	64	47	73	70		70			
ASN	100										
BLK	39	51	49	56	71	69	49	71	96		
HSP	51	58	57	64	73	65	49	77	83		
MUL	47	60		67	73						
WHT	67	60		81	76		69	88	93		
FRL	43	53	52	58	71	66	47	72	95		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

6th Grade historically is making lower gains than 7th and 8th grade in both ELA and Math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA Achievement of proficiency
Science achieve of proficiency

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Teacher need to focus on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of the learners along with challenging them the appropriate level.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in math for all grade level
Algebra EOC proficiency

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Targeted skills support, small group support, intensive math support with collaborative planning with teachers.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Differentiated support in ELA, small group support in ELA
Reading support in 8th grade science

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

On going training to support differentiated instruction. Monthly PLC focus on HCPS Instructional framework model

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Use of success coach and magnet lead teacher to support tier interventions and training of teacher in differentiated instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

CNA analysis: Teachers are focused on teaching to the middle instead of planning for differentiation.

Measurable Outcome:

If we effectively progress monitor student learning and plan differentiated instruction that support standards-based instruction then:

- The percent of students achieving proficiency on
- FSA ELA will increase from 51% to 56%,
- FSA Math will increase from 47% to 56%
- Civics EOC will increase from 63% to 75%
- Middle Acceleration will increase from 75% to 90%
- SSA will increase from 32 to 45%

Student learning gains in:

- ELA will increase from 50% to 60%,
- Math will increase from 52% to 60%
- BQ ELA learning gains will increase from 42% to 55%.
- BQ Math learning gains will increase from 46% to 60%

Monitoring:

Achieve3000 reading data will be monitored on twice a quarter by ILT.

Success Coach and Lead Magnet Teacher will facilitate Level 3 interventions (review monthly)

Differentiation strategies will implemented per semester by PLCs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Differentiation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Differentiated instruction is an approach whereby teachers adjust their curriculum and instruction to maximize the learning of all students: average learners, English language learners, struggling students, students with learning disabilities, and gifted and talented students. Differentiated instruction is not a single strategy but rather a framework that teachers can use to implement a variety of strategies, many of which are evidence-based. These evidence-based strategies include: Employing effective classroom management procedures, Grouping students for instruction (especially students with significant learning problems), Assessing readiness, Teaching to the student’s zone of proximal development. (Iris.Peabody.Vanderbilt.edu)

Action Steps to Implement

Implement PLC collaborative planning to support progress monitoring of student learning and implementation of differentiated instruction.

Calendar out common assessment in core content in order to drive instruction.

Core content training on HCPS Instructional Frameworks. Focus on small groups. Will monitored in PLCs in monthly basis.

Train and support teachers in developing scaffolding strategies for targeted small group instruction.

Person Responsible Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

Bi-Weekly implementation of Newsela reading support in LA/Reading classes. Data will be monitored in PLCs and ILT Monthly

Person Responsible Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

Whole-School implementation of ACE writing strategy. All classes will implement ACE response bi-weekly. This will be monitored quarterly in faculty mtg student sample reviews.

Person Responsible Karen French (karen.french@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our discipline data is down slightly from 2018-19 to 2019-20. Student success coach will implement a restorative practices program in the 2122 school year. HCPS discipline will be monitored on a quarterly basis by the Adm/Guidance Team.

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.

We work to communicate every student's progress to the parents/guardians by sending home bi-weekly progress reports and holding quarterly Student Led Conferences. 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 communicating through ParentLink, Canvas, school website. We facilitate annual Mother Daughter Day Event and Father Daughter Dance in order to provide unique family experiences on our school campus. We have a success

coach that works with both students and parents on having a successful transition to middle and high school.

Examples of Events: Open House, Hispanic Heritage Month Saturday School Celebration, SAC Mtgs, Parent Link, Conference Nights, Volunteer Orientation/Recognition, Great American Teach-In, , Parent Workshop: Transition to Middle School, Cyber-bullying.

Furthermore being a Cambridge International School, Ferrell implement whole-school Global Perspective Challenges each semester. These challenges will focus on the 5 Cambridge Learner Attributes with a strong focus on collaboration.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

- Students - follow school Creed and HCPS Student Code of Conduct
- Staff - follow through with ongoing communication with students and parents/guardians
- Parents - actively support students and engage in open communication with staff
- Student Success Coach - implement / facilitate Restorative Practices
- Magnet Lead teacher - implement / facilitate Global Perspective Challenges

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00