

Pinellas County Schools

Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy



2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
R.A.I.S.E	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17

Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy

3030 N MCMULLEN BOOTH RD, Clearwater, FL 33761

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chad Meurer

Start Date for this Principal: 6/4/2018

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	Alternative
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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* Black/African American Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Maintaining 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: Maintaining
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy, along with the partnership of The Chi Chi Rodriguez Youth Foundation will provide quality educational opportunities for students and their families by educating and preparing each student for college, career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The student population at the Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy consists of students grades 4-8. Students are typically below grade level in one or more core subject areas. Students may also struggle socially and lack motivation. The Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy provides smaller class sizes along with classes that have a teaching assistant to help meet our student's needs. The Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy also provides students with some unique learning opportunities such as gardening, golf, and a shadowing program.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Meurer, Joshua	Academy Director	Director of the Chi Chi Rodriguez Academy performs day to day administrator duties including overseeing Title 1 and Testing Administrator.
Messina, Lauren		Work with students and families on an individual basis to meet counseling needs. Teach weekly counseling lessons to all grade level classes. Create and hold meeting pertaining to student's 504 plans. Assist Academy Director as needed and fulfill director role when the director is out.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

All teachers and teacher assistants are Pinellas County Schools employees.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/4/2018, Chad Meurer

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

65

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

6

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

5

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

0

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

0

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

0

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	5	15	17	16	12	0	0	0	0	65
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4	6	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/17/2022

2021-22 - 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	4	8	18	16	17	0	0	0	0	63
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	0	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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	9	5	0	0	0	0	25

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	4	2	4	0	0	0	0	10

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data 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		55%	55%					70%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								63%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								56%	54%
Math Achievement		34%	42%					72%	62%
Math Learning Gains								63%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								54%	52%
Science Achievement		57%	54%					64%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		57%	59%					81%	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
04	2022					
	2019	9%	56%	-47%	58%	-49%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019	18%	54%	-36%	56%	-38%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2022					
	2019	25%	51%	-26%	54%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2022					
	2019	18%	51%	-33%	52%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	55%	-28%	56%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2022					
	2019	18%	64%	-46%	64%	-46%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2022					
	2019	24%	60%	-36%	60%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
06	2022					
	2019	6%	44%	-38%	55%	-49%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
07	2022					
	2019	18%	60%	-42%	54%	-36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	31%	14%	46%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	24%	54%	-30%	53%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	51%	-6%	48%	-3%
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	64%	68%	-4%	71%	-7%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	14	38		8	42						
BLK	19	32		20	35						
WHT	22	35		20	50		20				
FRL	18	35		19	48		18				

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	14	31		7	8						
ELL	10	50		20	30						
BLK	20	44		15	22						
HSP	10										
WHT	16	20		19	17		31				
FRL	16	26		14	15	9	32				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	7	33		7	27						
WHT	24	45		28	24		45				
FRL	20	45	45	23	33	27	35				

ESSA Data Review

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	239
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	3
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	29
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	28
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

After reflecting on our Areas of Focus from the previous year we will continue to utilize the iReady reading program, LLI reading intervention program, Dreambox for elementary math and IXL for middle school math. We will also utilize Title 1 rollover funds to hire a part time hourly reading and math intervention teacher.

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

Based on our ESSA subgroup progress monitoring data the math data of our students in the sub group EDS showed the greatest improvement. We have fully implemented the IXL program with our middle school math students and shifted our schedule to have a classroom teaching assistant in our middle school classes for a longer period of time.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

ELA and Reading is where we need to show improvement this year. We were unable to reach our SIP goal in 2022 for growth. The data shows our students really struggled with key ideas and details along with craft and structure. These problematic components are based on FSA results.

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

We saw better improvements in mathematics than reading for the first time in a while. This up word trend was pretty consistent in all grade levels and sub groups except 8th grade. We saw a trend of improving data in middle school ELA according to iReady assessments but this did not carryover to FSA results.

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

We will continue to use small group instruction by utilizing our teaching assistants. We will use our part time hourly teachers to provide one on one reading intervention. We will also continue to grow our ELP program for math by adding elementary students for this year. We will also focus on taking a closer look at and use data and progress monitoring results to help drive instruction.

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

Our staff will continue to take professional development related to their subject area and other PD such as Youth Mental Health First Aid to better understand our unique student population and the challenges they face. Our middle school staff will also have the opportunity to participate in facilitated team planning sessions after school.

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

All 3 of our ESSA subgroups scored less than 41% on the federal percent of points in index. These subgroups include; white, black/African American, and EDS. Our 8th graders in these sub groups showed the greatest decrease.

Measurable Outcome:

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

40% of the students in these subgroups will make learning gains as indicated by the 2023 FAST ELA and Math assessments.

Monitoring:

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

Academy director will consistently meet with instructional staff to discuss the progress and data results of the progress monitoring tools we are implementing. Including FAST results, IXL data, iReady data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will utilize our ELP program in middle school and begin implementing an ELP program for our elementary students as well. We will also continue to utilize a variety of technology based resources to improve ELA and math skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

The ELP will provide students with extra time to work on foundational skills in math they may be lacking. The technology programs are evidence based and diagnostic. They provide individualized results that drive instruction and reinforce the daily lessons being taught.

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.

Elementary students will be assessed three times per year using the FAST assessment to monitor both math and ELA progress.

Person Responsible

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Middle school students will be assessed using IXL computer based math program in the fall and spring. Middle school students will also be assessed using the iReady diagnostic in the fall and spring.

Person Responsible

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Administrator will conduct and provide actionable feedback for regular classroom walkthroughs and observations to ensure that new strategies and best practices are being implemented correctly and with fidelity.

Person Responsible

Joshua Meurer (pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

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

We are a 4-8 school and do not have students in Grades K-2.

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

83% of our 4th and 5th graders scored below a level 3 in ELA. This is definitely a critical need for our school. We have introduced an ELP program for both 4th and 5th grade. Students will have the option to come 4 days a week before school to get extra support in ELA. We have also introduced a new reading incentive program to encourage students to read independently at home. 4th and 5th grade students who scored below grade level will be pulled out for reading intervention by our part time hourly teacher.

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)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

We will increase the number of 4th and 5th grade students scoring at proficiency level by 20% in ELA.

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.

This data will be monitored by looking at FAST results and discussing the progress of students at PLC meetings. We will also look closely at the data comparing students who attend ELP and those who do not, to monitor it's effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org

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?

Our 4th and 5th graders will utilize the iStation intervention program and long with LLI and Jan Richardson guided reading provided by the reading intervention teacher.

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?

The intervention were selected because they are evidence based, diagnostic, and align to the BEST standards. These programs provide individualized results that drive instruction.

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
We do not have a literacy coach on staff but or teachers will reach out to district literacy leaders and coaches when needed to help implement strategies necessary to address the area of focus. Teachers will continue to take the necessary professional development to have a strong understanding of the intervention programs we are using. These programs will also be discussed and reviewed during PLC's.	Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org
Teachers will continue to take the necessary professional development to have a strong understanding of the intervention programs we are using. These programs will also be discussed and reviewed during PLC's.	Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

Parent Engagement

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

The data will be collected from completed parent surveys and sign in sheets. These surveys and sign in sheets will be collect at all parent engagement nights. Based on the results of these surveys we will be able to create events and provide our parents the support they are seeking. By doing this we hope to see an increase in the percentage of parents who attend our family engagement nights, conferences, and other school activities.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

We will continue to reach out to parents on a daily basis through student planners. We will communicate through school messenger and our school website. Teachers will make phone calls to parents when necessary and be available when parents have questions or concerns. We will also let parents know that we want them to be involved and we want them to share their opinions on surveys, the Title 1 budget,

engagement nights, and all other areas of what goes on at school. It will be important for parents to know that parent engagement is part of our SIP and we all want to work together to make it successful.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Implementation will be monitored by viewing and tracking the percentage of parents who attend conferences, IEP/504 meetings, engagement nights, and any other school functions that parents are invited to attend.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Make all parent involved events free and held at times the best accommodate families work schedules.	Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org
Track the percentage of parents who provide input and attend school activities	Meurer, Joshua, pcs.meurerj@pcsb.org