

Orange County Public Schools

Millennia Gardens Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Millennia Gardens Elementary

3515 GARDENS RIDGE WAY, Orlando, FL 32839

<https://millenniagardenses.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Michelle Carralero

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
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)	100%
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 (44%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 Orange 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

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

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
Carralero, Michelle	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate conversations about school data and where growth can continue to occur - Observe classrooms and provide feedback with a plan for growth - Monitor data points for grade levels assigned - Perform trend walks to see that what is planned is being carried out across the grade levels - Provide professional development on areas that are crucial for academic excellence - Attend Collaborative Curriculum sessions to guide conversations on reading, math or science
Davis-LaRue, April	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate conversations about school data and where growth can continue to occur - Observe classrooms and provide feedback with a plan for growth - Monitor data points for grade levels assigned - Perform trend walks to see that what is planned is being carried out across the grade levels - Provide professional development on areas that are crucial for academic excellence - Attend Collaborative Curriculum sessions to guide conversations on reading, math or science
Jones, Stella	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate conversations about school data and where growth can continue to occur - Monitor data points for grade levels assigned - Perform trend walks to see that what is planned is being carried out across the grade levels - Provide professional development on areas that are crucial for academic excellence - Attend Collaborative Curriculum sessions to guide conversations on reading, math or science
Haas, Celeste	Instructional Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate conversations about school data and where growth can continue to occur - Monitor data points for grade levels assigned - Perform trend walks to see that what is planned is being carried out across the grade levels - Provide professional development on areas that are crucial for academic excellence

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attend Collaborative Curriculum sessions to guide conversations on reading, math or science
Bryant, Travis	Dean	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate conversations about school data and where growth can continue to occur - Provide professional development on areas that are crucial for social emotional and academic excellence - Attend Collaborative Curriculum sessions to guide conversations on reading, math or science

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/30/2019, Michelle Carralero

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.*

1

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Elementary School PK-5</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p>2018-19 Title I School</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)</p>	<p>Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students</p>

(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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	59	142	133	161	152	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	786
Attendance below 90 percent	15	25	25	35	29	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	23	16	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
Course failure in Math	0	1	1	21	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	1	3	21	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/14/2020

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	159	146	187	174	150	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	972
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	45	56	26	44	35	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	4	11	3	9	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
-------------------------	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	3	3	5	27	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
-------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	98	73	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

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	3	7	3	50	27	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	159	146	187	174	150	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	972
Attendance below 90 percent	45	56	26	44	35	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232
One or more suspensions	4	11	3	9	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	3	5	27	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	98	73	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239

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	3	7	3	50	27	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	40%	57%	57%	44%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	58%	61%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	52%	53%	72%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	42%	63%	63%	46%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	51%	61%	62%	55%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	50%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	38%	56%	53%	45%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	31%	55%	-24%	58%	-27%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	57%	-16%	58%	-17%
	2018	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
	2018	36%	55%	-19%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	29%	62%	-33%	62%	-33%
	2018	42%	61%	-19%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	63%	-19%	64%	-20%
	2018	41%	62%	-21%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	39%	57%	-18%	60%	-21%
	2018	38%	59%	-21%	61%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	34%	54%	-20%	53%	-19%
	2018	33%	53%	-20%	55%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	48	53	18	29	25					
ELL	36	54	45	42	53	38	34				
BLK	38	54	53	36	48	41	35				
HSP	41	51	39	47	54	33	42				
WHT	59			47							
FRL	35	55	59	39	49	39	37				

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	14	53		10	29	30					
ELL	36	65	69	38	55	55	20				
BLK	38	58	73	40	50	39	34				
HSP	49	66	74	53	59	61	54				
WHT	50	55		43	64						
FRL	42	61	75	45	54	50	45				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
---	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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 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	53
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

The learning gains from our lowest 25% in ELA and Math showed the lowest performance. These students were not pulled for small group instruction at their instructional level consistently and the intervention curriculum was not used with fidelity.

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

The data component with the greatest decline from the prior year was Learning gains in ELA and Math. This was due to a lack of monitoring and consistent interventions.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the percentage of students proficient in Math. This can be attributed to how data was monitored, the instructional strategies used, and the lack of incorporating the concrete, representational, abstract model.

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

We had the least amount of drop in Math proficiency. The school incorporated specific center rotation schedules in the area of math this year as well as training using the concrete, representational, and abstract model.

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

Areas of concerns to focus on based on the EWS data, are the percentage of students with attendance under 90% and the number of students scoring a level one in reading and math.

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

1. Learning Gains in Reading based on FSA
2. Learning Gains in Math based on FSA

- 3. proficiency in Science based on FCAT
- 4. Attendance rate

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the FSA data and the End of Year i-Ready Diagnostic results, learning gains in reading dropped in comparison to previous school year data. In order to increase overall proficiency, we must close the achievement gap by having students make a minimum of one year's growth equivalent to a learning gain.
Measureable Outcome:	Students will increase in the area of reading (all reading domains) by 5% based on the i-Ready beginning-of-year, mid-year, and end-of-year assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Carralero (michelle.carralero@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student learning gains will increase when teachers collaboratively plan for scaffolded, rigorous, standards-based instruction that includes content specific, complex texts and standards-aligned tasks. As Tier I instruction is strengthened and interventions are implemented and executed, student achievement in proficiency and learning gains will continue using literacy strategies.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This area was determined to be an area of focus due to the number of students who did not make learning gains based on the FSA assessment and i-Ready Diagnostic results. This had a negative impact on the number of students who were proficient in English Language Arts (ELA) as determined by the FSA assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation with fidelity of interventions as well as monitoring of student movement within interventions specific to our ESSA subgroup of 29% ESE students.
2. Providing staff with specific professional development to meet individual student needs
3. Providing staff with ongoing actionable feedback from trend walks and observations
4. Implementation of acceleration in reading for students working a year below grade level
5. Implementation of science instruction and hands-on labs to strengthen comprehension skills

Person Responsible Michelle Carralero (michelle.carralero@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on the FSA data and the End-of-Year i-Ready Diagnostic Results, learning gains in math dropped in comparison to previous school year data. In order to increase overall proficiency, we must close the achievement gap by having students make a minimum of one years growth equivalent to a learning gain.

Measureable Outcome: Students will increase in the area of math (all math domains) by 5% based on the i-Ready beginning-of-year, mid-year, and end-of-year assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: April Davis-LaRue (april.davis-larue@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Student learning gains will increase when teachers collaboratively plan for scaffolded, rigorous, standards-based instruction that includes content specific, complex texts and standards-aligned tasks. As Tier I instruction is strengthened and interventions are implemented and executed, student achievement in proficiency and learning gains will continue using effective math strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This area was determined to be an area of focus due to the number of students who did not make learning gains based on the FSA assessment and i-Ready Diagnostic results. This had a negative impact on the number of students who were proficient in math as determined by the FSA assessment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensuring that staff are appropriately implementing effective math strategies.
2. Implementation with fidelity of small group instruction based on specific domain needs for each student
3. Providing staff with specific professional development to meet individual student needs
4. Providing staff with ongoing actionable feedback from trend walks and observations
5. Implementation of acceleration in math for students working a year below grade level

Person Responsible April Davis-LaRue (april.davis-larue@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs of social skills.

Measureable Outcome: Improvement in Early Warning Systems indicator data with a 5% decrease of students with more than two indicators monitored by cognia survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Travis Bryant (travis.bryant@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development on how to embed social emotional learning activities into daily lessons.
2. Incorporate surveys for students, staffs, and parents to assist in determining which activities to provide more training on.

Person Responsible Travis Bryant (travis.bryant@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers and administrators will collaborate and reflect on best practices for implementing a culturally responsive environment. Teachers and administrators will participate in specific professional development to increase capacity in culturally responsive strategies to support student achievement and increase student attendance. The intended outcome will be to build capacity in culturally responsive strategies to support student needs.

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.

We welcome parents to school holding many night time activities in reading, math, science and writing. Our Parent Engagement Liaison (PEL) surveys the parents on what is needed to help them at home so the family can be part of the school events. Connect Orange messages go out weekly and chart the upcoming events for the families. We keep our marquee updated with current events and focused messages. We also embed Culturally Responsive Program with students and staff through guidance lessons and staff development.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00