

Volusia County Schools

T. Dewitt Taylor Middle High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

T. Dewitt Taylor Middle High School

100 E WASHINGTON AVE, Pierson, FL 32180

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/taylor/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Kathleen Gibbons

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

T. DeWitt Taylor Middle High School strives to be a community of lifelong learners. We welcome our students, staff, and families to learn together, engaging everyone with challenging academics and a focus on becoming responsible and active citizens in our ever changing society.

Provide the school's vision statement

The heartbeat of Taylor Middle-High School is working together to achieve academic excellence, self-worth, and multicultural respect through a caring environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gibbons, Kathy	Principal	
Rubio, Marisol	Assistant Principal	
Pearce, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	
LaMondie, Laurie	Assistant Principal	
Haigh, Tracy	Instructional Coach	
Fenwick, Bonnie	Instructional Coach	
Henderson, Serene	Teacher, K-12	
Cronise, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Kathleen Gibbons

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	77%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	161	144	169	152	114	124	1002
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	7	13	2	6	42
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	21	20	23	80
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	46	50	40	35	26	274
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	35	58	49	33	21	23	241
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total					
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12						
Students with two or more indicators							0	0	0	0	0	12	24	38	40	30	25	22	191

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	4	1	2	9	1	1	1	19
Students retained two or more times							0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	8	6	2	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	157	187	171	131	144	149	1121
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	16	21	18	12	19	38	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	1	1	1	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	15	8	15	26	35	114
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	79	72	54	48	52	59	437

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	17	11	18	11	17	19	0	93

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	2	5	17	1	0	1	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	182	157	187	171	131	144	149	1121
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	16	21	18	12	19	38	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	1	1	1	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	15	8	15	26	35	114
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	79	72	54	48	52	59	437

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	17	11	18	11	17	19	0	93

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	2	5	17	1	0	1	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	52%	56%	41%	51%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	49%	51%	45%	47%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	37%	42%	39%	37%	44%
Math Achievement	41%	48%	51%	37%	49%	51%
Math Learning Gains	45%	49%	48%	48%	50%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	38%	45%	41%	44%	45%
Science Achievement	54%	76%	68%	57%	71%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	48%	69%	73%	59%	66%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	32%	50%	-18%	54%	-22%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	52%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	47%	-13%	52%	-18%
	2018	38%	47%	-9%	51%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	41%	50%	-9%	56%	-15%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	58%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
09	2019	41%	51%	-10%	55%	-14%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	43%	50%	-7%	53%	-10%
	2018	36%	49%	-13%	53%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	26%	48%	-22%	55%	-29%
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	52%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	34%	47%	-13%	54%	-20%
	2018	33%	44%	-11%	54%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	41%	29%	12%	46%	-5%
	2018	24%	37%	-13%	45%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	48%	57%	-9%	48%	0%
	2018	46%	60%	-14%	50%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	72%	-11%	67%	-6%
2018	63%	65%	-2%	65%	-2%
Compare		-2%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	68%	-26%	71%	-29%
2018	52%	66%	-14%	71%	-19%
Compare		-10%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	63%	-10%	70%	-17%
2018	58%	63%	-5%	68%	-10%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	54%	-8%	61%	-15%
2018	36%	57%	-21%	62%	-26%
Compare		10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	54%	55%	-1%	57%	-3%
2018	40%	55%	-15%	56%	-16%
Compare		14%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	38	40	18	37	29	26	17		90	11
ELL	13	34	41	22	34	40	25	26	46	71	24
BLK	24	48		13	8						
HSP	33	43	41	36	43	39	49	42	71	85	35
WHT	51	50	41	52	52	27	67	59	68	87	60
FRL	35	44	43	37	42	35	51	43	69	85	33

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	18	40	35	14	29	31	16	37		81	29
ELL	9	32	38	15	39	38	19	35			
BLK	16	17		19	45						
HSP	35	44	40	33	47	42	51	54	75	79	48
WHT	53	48	41	46	48	39	68	69	76	85	43
FRL	36	44	39	33	46	41	54	55	72	80	42

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	591
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	23
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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
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	56
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	47
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Math Achievement in Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%

- * An ineffective teacher was released after the first semester, then the class had over a month of substitutes
- * Students unmotivated with fear of failure

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

Social Studies Achievement

- * One of two teachers with the majority of students -- including all regular education and ESE students was new to TMHS and teaching Civics
- * Lack of teacher priority for End of Course Assessment prep

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Social Studies Achievement

- * One of two teachers with the majority of students -- including all regular education and

ESE students was new to TMHS and teaching Civics
* Lack of teacher priority for End of Course Assessment prep

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

Math Achievement
* Math Coach
Addition of a math intervention teacher

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

Retention in the same grade

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

1. Social Studies Achievement
2. Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains
3. ELA Achievement
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our data indicated a clear discrepancy between teacher grades and standardized assessment scores. The SLT determined that this discrepancy indicated that the rigor in our classrooms needed to increase. In addition, there needed to be a refocus on standards aligned instruction.
Measureable Outcome:	Increase percentage of students proficient on FSA ELA assessment from 39% to 54% Increase percentage of students proficient on Math LQ from 36 to 54% Increase percentage of students proficient on Social Studies end of course assessment from 45% to 54%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The focus of school-based PLC's will be to use school based learning walks to recalibrate classroom instruction with standard aligned instruction. In addition, PLC's will be provided feedback from questioning pop ins and coaching observations. This is meant to help ensure a higher level of learning is attained, guides teachers in the process of assessment and keeps students on track. Standards aligned instruction guides the planning, implementation, and assess of student learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The intent for selecting this specific strategy is to enhance the strength and depth of classroom instruction. The SLT is committed to providing support for standards aligned instruction in every classroom.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitoring/Coaching through "Question Pop-Ins" -- data reviewed with SLT and discussed at PLCs

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District & school-based learning walks

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data collection tool created by SLT to monitor levels of questioning through "Questioning Pop-Ins"

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Whole faculty book study on CHAMPS

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

When students are engaged in learning, they are not merely “busy, ”nor are they only “on task.” Rather, they are intellectually active in learning important and challenging content. The critical distinction between a classroom in which students are compliant and busy and one in which they are engaged is that in the latter students are developing their understanding through what they do.

Measureable Outcome:

Increase percentage of students proficient on FSA ELA assessment from 39% to 54%
 Increase percentage of students proficient on Math LQ from 36 to 54%
 Increase percentage of students proficient on Social Studies end of course assessment from 45% to 54%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Implementation of a school wide behavior management system - CHAMPS model

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

A school wide behavior management system is an effect way to attain social and learning outcomes wil preventing and changing problem behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

Selected teacher-leaders attend AVID summer conference

Person Responsible

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Data collection tool created by SLT to monitor levels of questioning through "Classroom Pop-ins"; data discussed with PLCs

Person Responsible

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring/Coaching through "Classroom Pop-ins"

Person Responsible

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

School-based learning walks using IPG

Person Responsible

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Whole faculty book study -- CHAMPS

Person Responsible

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Pre-planning professional development on student engagement by Academic Coaches

Person Responsible

Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Research shows that most teachers found regular, frequent feedback to be helpful in professional development and teachers valued peer and mentor observation and feedback.

Measureable Outcome: Increase percentage of students proficient on FSA ELA assessment from 39% to 54%
Increase percentage of students proficient on Math LQ from 36 to 54%
Increase percentage of students proficient on Social Studies end of course assessment from 45% to 54%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Higher level/Rigorous Questioning (Costa's Levels of Questioning)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Hattie effect size: 0.41
The most effective questions are high order 'why?' 'how?' and 'which is best?' questions that really make students think. They need to be given time to think, too; and can do better if they work in pairs than work alone. Good teachers use divergent as well as convergent questions, framed in such a way that they invite students to formulate hypotheses, make connections, or challenge previously held views.

Action Steps to Implement

Data collection tool created by SLT to monitor levels of questioning through "Classroom Pop-ins"; data discussed with PLCs

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring/Coaching through "Classroom Pop-ins"

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Whole faculty book study -- CHAMPS

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

District assessment data analyzed with PLCs

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring/Coaching through "Questioning Pop-Ins" -- data reviewed with SLT and discussed at PLCs

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Training for faculty on the IPG; IPG used during school-based learning walks

Person Responsible Kathy Gibbons (kgibbons@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Our identified priorities outlined in 2.E are addressed in the three areas of focus outlined above.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parental involvement activities, such as orientation activities, "Math Night", "AVID Night", "Science Night", and other events related to core instructional areas, provide workshop opportunities for families to receive free project materials and gain strategies for increasing skills in reading and math. Additional events are scheduled to involve parents in assisting students with decisions regarding dual enrollment and advanced placement learning opportunities. Parents have access to school counselors at these events for academic feedback and collaborative strategy dialogue. Stakeholders are also on hand to provide assistance for academic success for students enrolled in programs, such as ESOL and ESE. The campus is opened for families regularly after school to provide access for technology, Gradebook access, and research. A large percentage of parents are Spanish speakers. As a result, all school sponsored activities include translation services from English to Spanish, in order to achieve effective communication.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Specific Teacher Feedback	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00