Cedar Key High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Cedar Key High School

951 WHIDDON AVE, Cedar Key, FL 32625

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Lawrence

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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

Cedar Key School, in conjunction with the community, will provide an education for our students that will encourage them to become academically proficient, life-long learners, skilled communicators and problem-solvers, and productive citizens of their community.

Provide the school's vision statement

Cedar Key School's vision is for all students to graduate career and college ready, possessing the skills for future success.

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
Lawrence, Kathy	Principal	The principal works with the Lead Team to drive the educational plan of the school. The principal develops Lead Team members into School Improvement leaders: they study data, help assess progress towards goals, make course corrections, help implement change, and serve as liaisons between the faculty and the administration for open communication regarding school initiatives. The principal conducts school improvement professional development sessions and holds regular data chats with individual teachers, teacher groups, and students. The principal implements, monitors, and makes adjustments to all school improvement initiatives.
Campbell, Linda	Instructional Coach	Linda, as the school's reading coach, is responsible for supporting ELA goals. She provides professional development, coaches and models in classes, and helps organize reading interventions across the grade levels.
Hudson-Lane, Jennie	Guidance Counselor	Jennie-Lynn supports the school with behavioral counseling and works with the SIP Lead Team to support our goals. She also coordinates with the Mental Health Provider services to students.
Adams, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	Lauren is a middle and high school ELA teacher and the school's testing coordinator. She helps lead the effort to make our ELA goals.
Cato, Lenita	Teacher, K-12	Lenita is the second grade teacher on staff and leads the elementary teachers in working toward our ELA and math goals.
Voyles, Karen	Teacher, K-12	Karen is the lead teacher for the middle school. She leads the teachers in middle school in working toward our ELA and math goals.
Webb, Jeffrey	Dean	Mr. Jeffrey Webb is the Dean of Students and will be supporting the academic goals as well as the attendance goals of this SIP.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 6/23/2018, Kathryn Lawrence

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.*
3

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.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
24

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	3	9	3	6	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	3	7	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/31/2020

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	12	15	16	12	16	15	22	19	26	24	14	17	14	222
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	3	4	1	3	2	5	7	4	4	9	6	52
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	1	2	4	2	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	7	4	4	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	7	5	10	9	8	3	3	0	52

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	0	0	0	1	4	11	7	10	3	6	0	43

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	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4
Students retained two or more times	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	12	15	16	12	16	15	22	19	26	24	14	17	14	222
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	3	4	1	3	2	5	7	4	4	9	6	52
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	1	2	4	2	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	7	4	4	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	7	5	10	9	8	3	3	0	52

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	0	0	0	1	4	11	7	10	3	6	0	43

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	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4
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
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	48%	46%	61%	49%	44%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	48%	59%	61%	52%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	46%	54%	61%	48%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	51%	62%	56%	49%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	51%	59%	56%	53%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	42%	52%	48%	40%	52%
Science Achievement	64%	54%	56%	62%	51%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	78%	78%	93%	76%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	79%	52%	27%	58%	21%
	2018	50%	48%	2%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	48%	-10%	58%	-20%
	2018	25%	41%	-16%	56%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	13%	44%	-31%	56%	-43%
	2018	44%	44%	0%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-31%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
06	2019	58%	41%	17%	54%	4%
	2018	24%	35%	-11%	52%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		34%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
07	2019	22%	37%	-15%	52%	-30%
	2018	57%	41%	16%	51%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-35%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	9%	36%	-27%	56%	-47%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	58%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-50%				
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
09	2019	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
	2018	60%	40%	20%	53%	7%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
10	2019	75%	50%	25%	53%	22%
	2018	68%	38%	30%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	50%	55%	-5%	62%	-12%
	2018	61%	55%	6%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	59%	4%	64%	-1%
	2018	53%	59%	-6%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	27%	53%	-26%	60%	-33%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-25%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
06	2019	68%	45%	23%	55%	13%
	2018	23%	41%	-18%	52%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		45%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
07	2019	39%	55%	-16%	54%	-15%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	54%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-40%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
08	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%
	2018	67%	38%	29%	45%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-67%				
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	21%	49%	-28%	53%	-32%
	2018	64%	48%	16%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-43%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	72%	43%	29%	48%	24%
	2018	52%	44%	8%	50%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Cohort Comparison		8%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	92%	66%	26%	67%	25%
2018	74%	58%	16%	65%	9%
Compare		18%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	85%	72%	13%	71%	14%
2018	93%	73%	20%	71%	22%
Compare		-8%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	94%	68%	26%	70%	24%
2018	93%	66%	27%	68%	25%
Compare		1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	55%	57%	-2%	61%	-6%
2018	57%	44%	13%	62%	-5%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	79%	53%	26%	57%	22%
2018	63%	48%	15%	56%	7%
Compare		16%			

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	27	55	50	27	50	50					
WHT	49	43	45	57	56	50	64	87	68	100	56
FRL	44	44	46	46	52	55	51	92	63		

| 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	24	50	50	25	47		30				
HSP	73			55	60						
WHT	50	59	57	58	59	48	62	91	63		
FRL	41	56	59	49	50	50	53	92	50		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	673
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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
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	
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	
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
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	61
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	55
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

2019 8th Grade ELA and Math, due to most of the grade-level students being placed into Algebra I and Honors 9th Grade ELA. 7th graders scored low as well. 7 of them have been previously retained, and 7 of them have a 504 plan or IEP. A large number of this group struggle to read and comprehend what they are reading. Unfortunately, their math and ELA teachers were out due to extended illnesses for much of the school year as well.

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

The 8th grade ELA scores dropped 56% to only 9% passing. We enrolled grade-level 8th graders in 9th grade Honors English I; therefore, only the lower-level 8th graders were left in 8th grade ELA. 8th grade math dropped 67% to 0% passing. Only lower-level 8th graders take 8th grade pre-algebra because the others were enrolled in Algebra I. Our schoolwide ELA learning gains dropped as well, particularly in 4th and 5th grades. We had a new teacher in those grades.

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

ELA Achievement (-13%). Again, our 4th grade, 5th grade, and 7th grade scored low in ELA due to reasons mentioned above. Students scored low across all grades on two ELA strands: Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and Key Ideas and Details. In addition, current 7th and 8th graders scored low on all strands, including the strand that was high for all other cohorts, Language and Editing task.

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

Science achievement (+8%). Our 8th and 10th graders were able to excel on the science exams. Our 5th graders underperformed. We might have seen an even greater increase had our 5th graders done better. Our middle school 6th and 7th grade science teacher is doing a good job of preparing students for their 8th grade test, and our 8th grade and biology teacher consistently prepares our students to score above the state average.

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

Attendance below 90%
Level 1 achievement

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

1. Increase ELA learning gains from 43% to 60%.
2. Increase math learning gains from 55% to 60%.
3. Focus on raising learning gains in struggling cohorts: 3rd grade, 4th grade, 6th grade, 7th grade, 9th grade, and 11th grade.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The CKS faculty feels that we need to overcome socioeconomic barriers and prevailing mindsets that work against our students' becoming all that they can be. Students struggle to be organized, to care about doing rigorous classwork and homework, and to have a vision of their future that takes them very far beyond our island home.
Measureable Outcome:	ELA learning gains for all students as measured on our school report card will increase from 43% to 60%. Math learning gains for all students as measured on our school report card will increase from 55% to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The culture of AVID will be fostered daily throughout the entire Cedar Key School K-12. All teachers will work to increase rigor and organization through the use of WICOR strategies, with an emphasis on levels of questioning and focused note-taking.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Focused note-taking increases the retention rate of learning new material. WICOR strategies increase students' ability to comprehend text. Prompting student thinking with increased levels of questioning raises students' critical thinking.

Action Steps to Implement

Eleven teachers attended the AVID Summer Institute in June 2020.
All students are provided with binders and planners to enhance organizational skills. All teachers add items to the students' planners and notebooks to help students stay organized. All teachers receive ongoing training in focused note-taking, WICOR, and levels of questioning through monthly professional development sessions. (AVID Lead Team trains and Principal monitors implementation.)

Person Responsible	Kathy Lawrence (kathryn.lawrence@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through quarterly reviews of achievement data, particularly in reading and math, individual teachers, the school faculty and Lead Team, and the SAC will monitor and problem-solve identified gaps in performance in the struggling cohorts at grades 6, 7, and 9.

The SAC is particularly interested in closing gaps in the foundational skills of students in K-2. We will intensify the instruction at those grades by utilizing additional push-in supports and purchase supplemental resources to support phonics instruction to 55 students in grades K-5.

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.

CKS is taking a multi-pronged approach to build a positive school culture and environment by ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

--Students are involved with the school-wide integration of the AVID program with emphasis on growth mindset which leads the way to developing a positive school culture.
--All students work to pursue goals for future success by partnering with faculty experts, community supporters, college representatives, business leaders and mentors, parents, social services providers, and others.
--The faculty meets regularly to focus on how to advance a positive culture and environment. The Lead Team meets monthly to plan school events after seeking input and advice from the students and faculty at large.
--SAC - The school advisory team is made up of both school employees and community members who provide insight and advice on how to further improve both the activities and the culture of our school. Local businesses, City Commissioners, and the University of Florida personnel are strategic partners on our SAC.
--PTO - Faculty, staff and parents work monthly on programs to benefit our students, which result in a more positive environment. Members of local organizations work on our PTO to support our students by helping raise funds and plan events for them.
--The Cedar Key community embraces the activities of our school and students. They are heavily involved in providing guest speakers to student groups, raising funds for student scholarships, and volunteering with our sports, arts, academic, and CTE programs.
--The district supports our efforts to reach out to all stakeholders by providing ongoing professional development to our staff on family engagement, led by Dr. Steve Constantino.
--We maintain an open-door policy and welcome feedback and involvement from parents and families; we are responsive to their needs.

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: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00