

Marion County Public Schools

Fort McCoy School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jordan Surdam

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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 Marion 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fort McCoy School

16160 NE HIGHWAY 315, Fort Mc Coy, FL 32134

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

At Fort McCoy School, the staff works together in an environment of mutual respect and understanding toward the common goal of preparing students for a lifetime of learning, productive work, and responsible citizenship by serving the learning needs of the community in both traditional and innovative ways.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fort McCoy School, working together as partners with the total community, will prepare students for the future. We aim to provide an educational program that is academically challenging that includes meaningful instructional strategies and differentiation for all students. Our educational program engages each student by linking curricular content to previous knowledge and experience while remaining exciting enough to promote further exploration of new ideas. We recognize that we cannot reach our goals without the hard work of our Fort McCoy students, parents, and our community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Surdam, Jordan	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. The Principal supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Ostanik, Eric	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Elder, Dossella	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
North, Jamie	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal aids the Principal in providing leadership and vision necessary to create an atmosphere conducive to students learning at the highest possible level and assist in the operation of all aspects of the school.
Hunt, Leona	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach/Content Area Specialist coaches teachers on effective literacy strategies and interventions to increase and improve learning outcomes for the school
Favors, Jackie	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.
Taschenberger, Mary	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
McQueen, Tiffany	School Counselor	The School Counselor has knowledge and understanding of child development and the unique needs and characteristics of students served. Knowledge and understanding of guidance and counseling

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		principles, programs, and services. Knowledge of tests and measurement theory, and of community resources and services available for student assistance. Ability to counsel and assist students, parents, and school personnel in the resolution of problems in student learning, behavior, and mental health. Ability to administer student assessment and evaluation instruments. Ability to analyze and use data. Ability to verbally communicate and consult with parents, school personnel, and the public. Ability to maintain sensitivity to multicultural issues.
Woerner, Angela	Dean	The Student Services Manager (Dean) implements disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment.
Rivera, Mary	Teacher, K-12	The entire leadership team will be responsible for raising student achievement by supporting teachers with curriculum resources, modeling, behavior support, student counseling, and academic interventions. Mrs. Rivera provides instruction through the AVID program to close the opportunity gap. She models lessons for teachers and provides professional development, incorporating high-yield instructional strategies following the WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) model.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Jordan Surdam

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Total number of students enrolled at the school

957

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

9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	91	90	74	84	81	79	117	155	140	0	0	0	0	911
Attendance below 90 percent	45	38	30	33	31	33	50	78	61	0	0	0	0	399
One or more suspensions	9	11	10	14	27	15	50	66	55	0	0	0	0	257
Course failure in ELA	19	32	17	9	7	12	3	17	36	0	0	0	0	152
Course failure in Math	20	23	13	3	9	3	22	26	7	0	0	0	0	126
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	38	27	34	37	72	50	0	0	0	0	258
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	33	33	35	29	70	58	0	0	0	0	258
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	21	30	18	10	14	14	34	46	53	0	0	0	0	240

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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

Tuesday 8/2/2022

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	80	72	74	77	79	76	173	151	150	0	0	0	0	932	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	37	28	35	32	85	71	80	0	0	0	0	432	
One or more suspensions	4	7	5	17	13	11	50	50	51	0	0	0	0	208	
Course failure in ELA	14	11	25	8	5	13	47	17	38	0	0	0	0	178	
Course failure in Math	16	11	12	8	3	19	38	14	58	0	0	0	0	179	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	57	45	45	0	0	0	0	164	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	65	57	50	0	0	0	0	193	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	
	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	15	16	22	13	10	27	89	55	79	0	0	0	0	326	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	80	72	74	77	79	76	173	151	150	0	0	0	0	932	
Attendance below 90 percent	32	32	37	28	35	32	85	71	80	0	0	0	0	432	
One or more suspensions	4	7	5	17	13	11	50	50	51	0	0	0	0	208	
Course failure in ELA	14	11	25	8	5	13	47	17	38	0	0	0	0	178	
Course failure in Math	16	11	12	8	3	19	38	14	58	0	0	0	0	179	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	13	57	45	45	0	0	0	0	164	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	18	65	57	50	0	0	0	0	193	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	
	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	15	16	22	13	10	27	89	55	79	0	0	0	0	326

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	25	
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 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	32%	55%				40%	42%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						40%	45%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%						33%	36%	54%
Math Achievement	36%	34%	42%				38%	41%	62%
Math Learning Gains	50%						45%	51%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						37%	43%	52%
Science Achievement	34%	32%	54%				45%	40%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	43%	59%				49%	53%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	58%	44%	14%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	34%	49%	-15%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2022					
	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
06	2022					
	2019	38%	45%	-7%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				
07	2022					
	2019	36%	46%	-10%	52%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	50%	-3%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	47%	49%	-2%	62%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	64%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	24%	45%	-21%	60%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
06	2022					
	2019	35%	46%	-11%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
07	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	54%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2022					
	2019	30%	41%	-11%	46%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	38%	44%	-6%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	47%	44%	3%	48%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	51%	65%	-14%	71%	-20%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	86%	54%	32%	61%	25%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	31	33	8	35	48	10	25			
ELL	10			10							
HSP	35	42	33	36	53	50	19				
MUL	62	64		52	48						
WHT	37	41	43	36	50	58	35	53	38		
FRL	32	40	38	31	48	53	27	44	27		
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	10	30	28	13	36	40	3	22			
HSP	35	41	45	40	57	64	15	33			
MUL	70	69		50	50						
WHT	33	40	30	35	43	46	30	47	54		
FRL	28	38	31	30	43	44	24	46	47		
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	7	35	40	12	40	40	17	29			
HSP	34	49	29	44	50	42	40	82			
MUL	38	30		50	37						
WHT	40	40	33	37	44	36	44	48	46		
FRL	34	40	34	32	44	35	38	45	42		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	10
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	43
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

In 2022, overall ELA proficiency (+3%), ELA learning gains (+1%), and ELA bottom quartile learning gains (+9%) showed an increase. ELA grade level data indicates positive trends in grades 3-5, demonstrating significant gains in proficiency in both 4th (+10 from 2021) and 5th (+11% from 2021) grades. ELA grade level data in grades 6-8 shows a negative trend line with grade level proficiency decreasing in grades 7 (-5% from 2021) and grade 8 (-2% from 2021). Early Warning System data indicates that 28% of 3rd - 8th grade students scored a level 1 on the ELA FSA in 2022.

Overall math proficiency decreased 2% from 2019-2022, but remained the same from 2021-2022 (36%). Math bottom quartile learning gains are demonstrating a positive trend line, increasing 19% since 2019. Overall math learning gains also increased this year from 44% in 2021 to 50 % in 2022. Our greatest math decline occurred in the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency on the Algebra EOC,

falling 51% since 2019. Early Warning System data indicates that 28% of 3rd - 8th grade students scored a level 1 on the Math FSA in 2022.

Overall science achievement has decreased by 11% from 2019-2022, but school data demonstrated a 4% increase in science achievement from 2021-2022. Civics achievement increased by 5% from 2021-2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The 2022 state assessments and progress monitoring data demonstrate the greatest need for improvement in the areas of proficiency in English Language Arts (38%) and Math (36%). Learning gains are increasing in all areas of ELA and Math, but while students are demonstrating growth, it is not to the accelerated level needed to achieve overall proficiency. Our Algebra EOC proficiency declined significantly from 2021 to 2022 (-25%), which mirrored progressing monitoring data throughout the 21-22 school year. This impacted our school's acceleration data, resulting in a 12% decline from 2021 to 2022.

Science achievement demonstrates a continuous decline in proficiency in grade 5 from 2019-2022, as measured by the state assessment. Fifth grade science progress monitoring data remained stagnant with only 0.3 percent increase from the fall to mid-year Science Benchmark Assessment in the 2021-2022 school year. Eighth grade made growth in achievement in the state assessment by 3% from 2021-2022, but continues to fall below the district and state averages.

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

In the 2021-2022 school year, staff shortages and vacancies impacted student achievement significantly. Throughout the school year, two of our ESE self-contained classrooms, Pre-Algebra and Algebra classes, 6th grade ELA classes, and one first grade class did not have a certified teacher for the majority, if not all, of the school year. Although the continuous substitute or the paraprofessional in place in the classroom was supported by our Literacy Content Area Specialist, teacher leaders, and the leadership team, the level of instruction and student engagement decreased without a certified teacher.

Staff shortages have resulted in higher percentages of teachers being hired with an alternative certification pathway or little classroom experience. Fort McCoy School currently has 13 teachers with 3 or less years of teaching experience. With nearly 20% of the instructional staff falling into the category of an early career educator, there is a need for increased professional development in the areas of high-yield instructional strategies, lesson planning, and an understanding of the depth and breadth of grade level, content-area benchmarks.

In order to address the contributing factors to this need for improvement, recruitment efforts for certified, highly-qualified teachers need to remain a priority. Additionally, professional development and collaborative planning opportunities should support all teachers in planning and preparing standards-based lessons with task alignment, incorporating high-yield instructional strategies.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on progress monitoring data (QSMA district-based assessments), the most improvement can be found in Math learning gains and Math bottom quartile learning gains, which mirrored our state assessment gains in both of those areas as well. District progress monitoring data also showed gains in the area of Civics achievement, with 56% of students meeting the target goal for proficiency. 2022 State assessment data shows improvement in the area of ELA achievement (+3%), ELA learning

gains (+1%), ELA bottom quartile learning gains (+9%), Math learning gains (+6%), Math bottom quartile learning gains (+10%), Science achievement (+4%), and Civics achievement (+5%).

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

In 2021-2022, our Literacy Content Area Specialist worked closely with our primary teachers to accelerate foundational reading skills through systematic, explicit phonemic awareness and phonics instruction. We implemented Heggerty Phonemic Awareness routines in all PK-2nd grade classrooms. All PK through 5th

grade teachers engaged in authentic collaborative planning, lesson study cycles, coaching, and classroom modeling opportunities, based on the International Literacy Association standards for foundational skill instruction. Our elementary students made significant learning gains in the area of English Language Arts on the 2022 state assessment (4th Grade +10% and 5th grade +11%).

Our middle school teachers had quarterly opportunities for collaborative planning with teachers at a neighboring middle school. This provided them with an opportunity to engage in effective planning practices with others that teach the same grade level/content area. Additionally, a majority of our Math bottom quartile students in grades 6-8 received instruction through our Intensive Math class, using the Math 180 program. Progress monitoring data from this program demonstrated significant learning gains, further supporting by our 2022 state assessment data.

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

In the 2022-2023 school year, lesson study cycles will be implemented for all middle school grade levels. Lesson

study cycles will be led by our Academic Coaches and provide support in lesson planning, high-yield instructional strategies, and analyzing the impacts on student learning.

In order to provide additional support in the area of ELA and Math, an intervention teacher has been added through our Title I budget. The intervention teacher will support elementary Tier 3 students in ELA and Math by providing research-based intervention with fidelity.

Instructional rounds will be a schoolwide practice. These learning walks will allow us to develop a common language behind effective instruction for all classrooms, grade levels, and content areas.

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.

We will provide professional development in the following areas to accelerate learning for students and support teachers and leaders:

Early Career Educator Cadre - comprised of all teachers within their first three years of teaching, this cadre will meet bi-weekly to ensure retention of teachers. The meetings will focus on classroom management, lesson planning, parent communication, data, etc.

ELA and Math teachers will receive ongoing professional development in the BEST benchmarks. We will also support teachers in effective implementation of the new K-12 Math curriculum, its resources, scope and sequence, assessments, etc.

WICOR Wednesdays - Middle school teachers and elementary teachers will participate in WICOR Wednesdays. During these professional development opportunities, instructional coaches and teacher leaders will model high-yield instructional strategies for teachers to utilize in the classroom. WICOR strategies incorporate writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading.

Lesson Study Cycles - all 6-8 core teachers will participate in at least one lesson study cycle during the school year.

Instructional Rounds - all PK-8 core teachers will participate in at least one cycle of instructional rounds focused on our schoolwide improvement goal of standards-aligned instruction.

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

This year, we have added an Interventionist to our staffing plan to provide tier 3 support, lower ratios in tier 2 groups, and assist with data collection. This position will provide support for our most struggling students and help teachers interpret the data for targeted intervention and instruction.

We will work with a neighboring middle school to provide quarterly collaborative planning opportunities for our teachers. We will provide classroom coverage to allow teachers to travel to another campus and plan with teachers in their same grade level/content area. We will work to build relationships with a more local school and sustain this partnership for future years.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs**Area of Focus****Description**

and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

In 2022, 25% of our teachers earned needs improvement or unsatisfactory state VAM ratings. Currently, we have 13 teachers with 3 or less years of teaching experience on staff. Additionally, ELA and Math student achievement have remained stagnant over the past three years (2019-2022). This data strongly supports the need for consistent, specific teacher feedback in order to improve instructional practice and build teacher capacity.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If the administrative team provides teachers with consistent, timely, specific feedback, then instructional practice will improve and student achievement will increase by 3% in every tested area, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking and End of Course examinations.

ELA Achievement – 38% to 41%

ELA Learning Gains – 42% to 45%

ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 41% to 44%

Math Achievement – 36% to 39%

Math Learning Gains – 50% to 53%

Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 56% to 59%

Civics Achievement – 54% to 57%

Acceleration – 37% to 40%

ESSA Subgroups below ____

Students with Disabilities - Multiracial - ____

Economically Disadvantaged - ____

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The administrative team will utilize a shared document to schedule quarterly walkthroughs. This shared document will also allow the administrative team to document classroom visits and share actionable feedback given to individual teachers.

Student assessment data will also be utilized to monitor progress towards the desired outcome (iReady, DPMA, Benchmark Assessments, formative assessments, FAST, EOCs, etc.)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The administrative team will regularly visit classrooms, monitor instruction, and provide actionable teacher feedback. Instructional feedback will be based on school-wide expectations and initiatives including WICOR strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based

School administrators could provide the most frequent and comprehensive feedback to teachers leading to the development of practice (Mireles-Rios, 2019). Teacher quality impacts student achievement, so the importance of developing teacher practice cannot

Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

be overstated. The dual purposes of evaluation may seem in conflict with one another. The first purpose is accountability or achieving a goal. The second purpose is the improvement of practice (Ford & Hewitt, 2020). Principals who are more involved in and attentive to monitoring teachers' instructional practices through ongoing feedback increase teacher development (Huff, et al., 2018).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Create a walk-through checklist of high-yield instructional strategies with an additional area for providing actionable feedback.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Create a coaching-focused, quarterly walk-through schedule beyond the district-required observation schedule.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

The administrative team discusses walk-through feedback and needs within the teacher cadre to match professional learning to the needs of teachers based on walk-through data and student performance data.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

The instructional coach will follow up with coaching cycles or modeling as directed.

Person Responsible Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

**Area of Focus
Description
and Rationale:
Include a
rationale that
explains how it
was identified
as a critical
need from the
data reviewed.**

Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015, but fell to a D in 2021. In 2022, Fort McCoy improved to a C once again. Fort McCoy School earned 40% of the total points for school grade calculation in 2021, and 43% of the total points in 2022. In 2022, Fort McCoy students showed an increase in every school grade component, except for two areas. Math achievement remained constant, and the acceleration component saw a decrease of 12%. The increases we have seen across the year correlate with collaborative planning, but our implementation continues to develop.

Since 2019, state assessment data has shown a 2% decline in English Language Arts achievement in grades 3-8. Diagnostic and classroom assessment data show increases in foundational skills required to make gains in ELA proficiency. Reading proficiency is linked to student performance in all subject areas.

Since 2019, state assessment data has shown a 2% decline in Math achievement in grades 3-8. District and classroom assessment data further support the overall decline in Math proficiency.

Currently, Fort McCoy School has four ESSA subgroups falling below the 41% threshold, including Economically Disadvantaged (38%), English Language Learners (10%), Hispanic Students (38%) and Students with Disabilities (25%).

Standards-aligned instruction guides the lesson planning, implementation, and assessment of student learning in academic and elective content areas.

**Measurable
Outcome:
State the
specific
measurable
outcome the
school plans to
achieve. This
should be a
data based,
objective
outcome.**

If teachers are provided with collaborative planning opportunities, with a focus on task alignment and formative assessment, then student achievement will increase by 3% in all areas, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking and End of Course assessments.

ELA Achievement – 38% to 41%
 ELA Learning Gains – 42% to 45%
 ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 41% to 44%
 Math Achievement – 36% to 39%
 Math Learning Gains – 50% to 53%
 Math Bottom Quartile Learning Gains – 56% to 59%
 Civics Achievement – 54% to 57%
 Acceleration – 37% to 40%
 ESSA Subgroups below 41%:
 Students with Disabilities - 25% to 28%
 Hispanic Students - 38% to 41%
 Economically Disadvantaged - 38% to 41%
 English Language Learners - 10% to 13%

**Monitoring:
Describe how
this Area of
Focus will be
monitored for
the desired
outcome.**

A school administrator will participate in collaborative planning. Quarterly classroom walkthrough data, as well as District and state assessment data (such as iReady Diagnostic, DPMAs, Benchmark Assessments, FAST, MTSS, etc.), will be used to monitor the effectiveness of standards-aligned Tier 1 instruction. K-5 teachers will engage in peer observations to deepen understanding regarding lesson implementation after planning. Teachers will utilize formative assessment data to drive instruction with administration monitoring implementation through regular walkthroughs. Subgroup data will be monitored regularly through data digs.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Collective teacher efficacy is defined as the belief that teachers can more positively impact the learning of their students if they work as a team. Collaborative planning, with a focus on task alignment, and formative assessment, will positively impact collective teacher efficacy, thus improving student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective teacher efficacy not only influences productive teaching behaviors, but also results in a deeper implementation of school strategies, increased teacher leadership, high expectations, and receptivity to new ideas (Donohoo, 2018). John Hattie's 2018 updated list of factors related to student achievement identified collective teacher efficacy as the new number one factor in increasing student achievement, with an effect size of 1.57.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Coordinate with a neighboring middle school to provide quarterly opportunities for middle school teachers to collaborate with other teachers with the same grade level/content area. Due to the small population of our middle school, we only have one core subject area teacher per grade level, making true collaboration difficult.

Person**Responsible**

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Administrators and instructional coaches will be present during collaborative planning opportunities to facilitate conversations and focus on planning (B.E.S.T. benchmarks, B.E.S.T Instructional Guides for Mathematics (or the B1G-M), item clarifications, learning task alignment), implementation (high-yield instructional strategies), and assessment (formative assessment, Benchmark Assessment, DPMAs, EOCs, and FAST).

Person**Responsible**

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Coordinate walkthrough data from Area of Focus #1 to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of collaborative planning opportunities.

Person**Responsible**

Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus****Description**

and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015 but fell to a D in 2021. In 2022, Fort McCoy improved to a C once again. Since 2019, state assessment data has shown a 2% decline in English Language Arts achievement in grades 3-8. This year, in grades 3-5, ELA proficiency increased by 18%; in grades 6-8, ELA proficiency decreased by 5%. Diagnostic and classroom assessment data show increases in foundational skills required to make gains in ELA proficiency. Reading proficiency is linked to student performance in all subject areas.

Measurable**Outcome:****State the****specific****measurable****outcome the****school plans****to achieve.****This should****be a data****based,****objective****outcome.**

If teachers are provided with professional development in the area of ELA Lesson Study, then student achievement and learning gains will increase by 3% in ELA, as measured by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking.

ELA Achievement – 38% to 41%

ELA Learning Gains – 42% to 45%

ELA Bottom Quartile Learning Gains - 41% to 44%

Monitoring:**Describe how****this Area of****Focus will be****monitored for****the desired****outcome.**

A school administrator will participate in all lesson study cycles. Quarterly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady Diagnostic, Benchmark Assessments, FAST, MTSS, DPMAs, etc.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Person**responsible****for monitoring****outcome:**

Leona Hunt (leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-**based****Strategy:****Describe the****evidence-****based****strategy being****implemented****for this Area****of Focus.**

Lesson study focuses on student engagement and task alignment. It provides a valuable experience for teachers to investigate student learning, without the need to manage students. Lesson study allows teachers to collectively plan a lesson, observe, and reflect upon the lesson's effectiveness. Lesson study allows teachers to enjoy the satisfaction of classroom research and to influence education broadly through their own research lessons.

Rationale for**Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

According to the 2013 report on PD by the National School Boards Association's Center for Public Education, "Most teachers only experience traditional, workshop-based professional development, even though research shows it is ineffective. Over 90 percent of teachers participate in workshop-style training sessions during the school year. This

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

stands in stark contrast to teachers' minimal exposure to other forms of professional development. Despite its prevalence, the workshop model's track record for changing teachers' practice and student achievement is abysmal. Short, one-shot workshops often don't change teacher practice and have no effect on student achievement."

The Learning Policy Institute identifies seven widely shared features of effective PD. These include being content-focused, incorporating active learning, supporting collaboration in job-embedded context using models and modeling of effective practice, providing coaching/ expert support, offering feedback/reflection, and being of sustained duration. The Lesson Study format incorporates six of seven of these indicators for effective PD.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Partner with another middle school to be able to engage in the collegial discourse required in the planning and debriefing process.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Include another facilitator to assist with middle school lesson study implementation.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

Schedule a lesson study experience to include each grade level (K-8), expanding from elementary into middle school.

Person Responsible Jordan Surdam (jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015 but fell to a D in 2021. In 2022, Fort McCoy improved to a C once again. Since 2019, state assessment data has shown a 2% decline in English Language Arts achievement in grades 3-8. K-2 grade instruction provides the foundational skills necessary to develop reading comprehension. 49% of K-2 grade students will need additional support in reading instruction, based on iReady AP3 in the 2021-2022 school year.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Fort McCoy School has maintained a school grade of a C since 2015 but fell to a D in 2021. In 2022, Fort McCoy improved to a C once again. Since 2019, state assessment data has shown a 2% decline in English Language Arts achievement in grades 3-8. 3-5 grade students must continue to develop missing foundational skills, as well as expand their knowledge and self-monitoring strategies for comprehension. 60% of 3-5 grade students will need additional support in reading instruction.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

If teachers are provided with professional development in the area of ELA Lesson Study, then student achievement and learning gains will increase by 3% in ELA, as measured by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST). Students in Kindergarten through 2nd grade will increase 3% in the areas of phonics and phonemic awareness, as measured by PM1 to PM3 of the FAST assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

If teachers are provided with professional development in the area of ELA Lesson Study, then student achievement and learning gains will increase by 3% in ELA, as measured by the Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST).

ELA Achievement

-3rd Grade: 37% to 40%

-4th Grade: 44% to 47%

-5th Grade: 44% to 47%

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

A school administrator will participate in all lesson study cycles. Quarterly classroom walkthrough data, as well as district and state assessment data (such as iReady Diagnostic, iReady Progress Monitoring, FSA, FAST, MTSS, QSMA, etc.) will be used to monitor the effectiveness of Tier 1 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Lesson study focuses on student engagement and task alignment. It provides a valuable experience for teachers to investigate student learning, without the need to manage students. Lesson study allows teachers to collectively plan a lesson, observe, and reflect upon the lesson's effectiveness. Lesson study allows teachers to enjoy the satisfaction of classroom research and to influence education broadly through their own research lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

According to the 2013 report on PD by the National School Boards Association's Center for Public Education, "Most teachers only experience traditional, workshop-based professional development, even though research shows it is ineffective. Over 90 percent of teachers participate in workshop-style training sessions during the school year. This stands in stark contrast to teachers' minimal exposure to other forms of professional development. Despite its prevalence, the workshop model's track record for changing teachers' practice and student achievement is abysmal. Short, one-shot workshops often don't change teacher practice and have no effect on student achievement."

The Learning Policy Institute identifies seven widely shared features of effective PD. These include being content-focused, incorporating active learning, supporting collaboration in job-embedded context using models and modeling of effective practice, providing coaching/ expert support, offering feedback/reflection, and being of sustained duration. The Lesson Study format incorporates six of seven of these indicators for effective PD.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
K-2: Focus on the new phonics program as the instructional focus for lesson study. 3-5: Use data to address the greatest student need and instructional implications for lesson study.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Literacy Leadership will facilitate the learning of each grade level gathered. Create a calendar and provide needed coverage	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us
Administrative follow-up on instructional goals created by participants.	Surdam, Jordan, jordan.surdam@marion.k12.fl.us
Follow-up personalized coaching as advised by the administration or as provided in the assessment data.	Hunt, Leona, leona.hunt@marion.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

We continuously consult with our teachers, students, families, volunteers and School Advisory Council (SAC) throughout the year. We understand that our stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. As such, we start each school year with a meeting (notifications and invitations in English and Spanish) to address the following:

- A description and explanation of the school's curriculum,
- Information on the forms of academic assessment used to measure student progress, and
- Information on the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
- Explain the school parental Parent and Family Engagement Plan, and school-parent compact;

- Explain the right of parents to become involved in the school's programs and ways to do so;
- Explain that parents have the right to request opportunities for regular meetings for parents to formulate suggestions and to participate in decisions about the education of their children.
- Allow for feedback and open discussion.

In order to increase stakeholder engagement and promote a welcoming environment we will offer different modalities (online and paper based) of communication with to our families such as phone, email, Dojo and/or Remind App, Twitter, school website, teacher webpage, Skyward Parent Portal and school marquee.

Family and community feedback is requested/collected during quarterly SAC meetings, the Annual Parent Survey, Parent and Family Engagement Plan event surveys and Schoolwide Improvement Plan surveys.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

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

School Administrator: Work with our stakeholders to listen, revise, explain or change.

School Staff: Support all of our families and students along with staff.

Teachers: Provide educational and social-emotional opportunities to improve our students and their futures.

Counselors: Provide the opportunity for students to be what they want to be. They also provide social-emotional supports for our students.

Deans: Provide guidance on making the right choices while holding students accountable for their mistakes.

Parents: Provide their students to us and allow us to assist them in their future.

Students: Provide the opportunity to learn new things and expand their current knowledge.

Community: Provide support for our school community.

School Business Partners: Provide support for our school community and students.