Escambia County School District

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

10200 ASHTON BROSNAHAM RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Kristen Danley H

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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 is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School

10200 ASHTON BROSNAHAM RD, Pensacola, FL 32534

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	71%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is to encourage students to make the most of their potential; to become independent thinkers and lifelong learners; and to produce self-reliant, productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision a school where children are placed first. Our school is a loving and nurturing environment which emphasizes student performance and rewards it. It is a safe and orderly environment with guidelines and procedures that bring out the best in each child. R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place where parents, grandparents, and volunteers from all aspects of the community work toward one common goal of helping children achieve.

Our vision is one where learning is fostered through innovative and engaging techniques and ideas. R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place where developmentally appropriate activities are offered to students in such a manner as to foster the best academically in each child. It is a place where music, art, and P.E. are integrated with other forms of art and culture to enhance learning. It is a value rich environment where core values are lived and demonstrated by example. It is a place where administrators, teachers, and parents set standards and help students live up to those standards. It is a place where technology is integrated into the total curriculum. Finally, R.C. Lipscomb Elementary is a place that leads the way in every aspect of the educational program.

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
Quarells, Barbara	Assistant Principal	Facilitates the operation of all school programs, procedures, and safety protocol.
Sanders, Susan	Principal	Facilitates the operation of all school programs, procedures, and safety protocol.
Celis, Kimberly	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for third grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Druhl, Rachel	Teacher, ESE	Serves as grade level chair person for the ESE Team. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Presley, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for kindergarten. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Miller, Tammy	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for second grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Passmore, Neil	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for special areas. He attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. He facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
King, Christy	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for fifth grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Pitts, Missy	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for first grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.
Monk, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Serves as grade level chair person for fourth grade. She attends monthly leadership meetings. Leadership meetings include discussion about school policies, procedures, safety, curriculum, and concerns. She facilitates and shares information, to her grade level, on a weekly basis.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/13/2020, Kristen Danley H

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.*
4

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	85%
2019-20 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* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide

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	106	128	124	129	143	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	768
Attendance below 90 percent	14	31	21	20	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	2	3	5	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	7	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in Math	0	7	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	4	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	16	14	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	118	128	120	151	139	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	11	21	12	20	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	2	5	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	2	7	1	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	11	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	118	128	120	151	139	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	797
Attendance below 90 percent	11	21	12	20	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	2	5	0	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	9	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	22	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	2	7	1	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	16	14	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	71%	53%	57%	70%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	55%	58%	57%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	52%	53%	51%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	57%	63%	75%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	60%	62%	70%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	52%	51%	66%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	54%	53%	61%	50%	51%

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	77%	56%	21%	58%	19%
	2018	67%	52%	15%	57%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	68%	52%	16%	58%	10%

ELA							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
	2018	66%	51%	15%	56%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
05	2019	64%	51%	13%	56%	8%	
	2018	65%	44%	21%	55%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		-2%					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	71%	55%	16%	62%	9%	
	2018	69%	54%	15%	62%	7%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	71%	58%	13%	64%	7%	
	2018	76%	58%	18%	62%	14%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		2%					
05	2019	65%	55%	10%	60%	5%	
	2018	71%	52%	19%	61%	10%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		-11%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	71%	55%	16%	53%	18%	
	2018	67%	55%	12%	55%	12%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	43	56	46	46	57	34	53				
ASN	100	90		92	90						
BLK	41	45	41	45	53	43	52				
HSP	59	55		82	64						
MUL	69	62		58	60		67				
WHT	78	62	57	77	66	33	77				

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
FRL	60	58	55	59	59	42	57				

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40	45	35	51	55	41	56				
ASN	79			86							
BLK	43	55	48	49	62	50	33				
HSP	64			93							
MUL	62	69		54	75						
WHT	75	55	26	80	63	58	77				
FRL	60	52	43	67	65	55	58				

2017 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	45	40	39	42	44	36	24				
ASN	80			80							
BLK	46	50	45	48	61	60	38				
HSP	67			75							
MUL	61	43		59	36		45				
WHT	77	59	54	82	73	78	68				
FRL	60	53	47	69	69	62	51				

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 lowest 25th percentile was the lowest performing area for our school. We scored 41% in this area, compared to 55% from the previous year. Teachers focused more heavily on the ELA lowest quartile students and spent additional instructional time on reading interventions within small group instruction.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile showed the greatest decline from the previous year. We scored 41% in this area, compared to 55% from the previous year. Teachers focused more heavily on the ELA lowest quartile students and spent additional instructional time on reading interventions within small group instruction.

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.

We scored higher than the state, in every school grade component, with the exception of math lowest 25% percentile. We were 10% lower than the state in math lowest 25th percentile. Teachers focused more heavily on the ELA lowest quartile students and spent additional instructional time on reading interventions within small group instruction. mall group instruction.

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

ELA lowest 25th percentile showed the most improvement. We scored 55% as compared to 38% the previous year. We tracked the students from the beginning of the year, in the lowest quartile, using quarterly STAR assessment data. The school-wide data team met to manage and discuss the data. Data team members met with each grade level and developed a plan, for individual students, based on the data. We implemented many standards based resources and instruction to reach this population.

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

The number of students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments is an area of concern.

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

1. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
2. Level 1 on Statewide Assessments
3. Attendance Below 90 Percent

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math lowest 25th percentile was the lowest performing area for our school. We scored 41% in this area, compared to 55% from the previous year. Based on our data, the lowest quartile math students will benefit from a more applicable approach to understanding the how and why of solving mathematical equations. Lessons will include multiple strategies providing opportunities for a more concrete, multi-sensory development of number sense and operations. In addition, computer-based math instruction will be incorporated for both classroom and remote learning opportunities.
Measurable Outcome:	My math proficiency will improve by 5 percentile points for my students in the lowest quartile, going from 41% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Problem solvers who know how to use multiple strategies to solve problems may be more successful. When regularly exposed to problems that require different strategies, students learn different ways to solve problems. As a result, students become more efficient in selecting appropriate ways to solve problems and can approach and solve math problems with greater ease and flexibility.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Exposing students to multiple problem-solving strategies improved students' procedural flexibility— their ability to solve problems in different ways using appropriate strategies. When students are instructed in using multiple strategies to solve the same problem, procedural knowledge improves. Additional instructional components such as checklists and/or visual aids may also assist with procedural knowledge.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will be given STAR and iReady beginning-of-the-year assessments. Teachers will analyze STAR and iReady math data.
2. School Data Team and MTSS Team will work together to provide professional development on multiple problem-solving strategies for math. PD will include Universal Design for Learning strategies for each Tier Group.
3. Teachers will receive training in iReady to use the teacher toolbox; this toolbox provides multiple problem-solving strategies to enhance traditional instruction. Teachers will participate in math training to provide remote math tools, practice, and manipulatives for students working in school and at home. Grade levels will meet weekly to discuss math strategies and implementation. Weekly meetings will address the impact of the implementation of strategies on student data. Grade levels will submit weekly notes and provide data analysis on math progress.
4. Students will be given additional STAR and iReady assessments to progress monitor throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Susan Sanders (ssanders@ecsdfl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Ensuring that our teachers are prepared for remote and/or virtual instruction. We will provide on-going professional development related to remote instruction led by teacher/leaders.
2. Enhanced safety procedures will be implemented school-wide, due to Covid-19, to ensure the safety of staff and students participating in traditional instruction.

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.

R.C. Lipscomb Elementary School has a positive school culture and environment that provides opportunities for involvement in a variety of ways. Our PTA has almost 100% membership within our faculty, staff, and families. There are various opportunities for families, students, staff, and the community to participate in events at our school that include but are not limited to our Veteran's Day Program, grade level musicals, Mad Scientist Day, Tropicana Speech Contest, Dad's Day, Volunteer Appreciation Luncheon, Mentors, and Grandparent luncheons.

We also have evening events that give a greater opportunity for families to be involved. Some of these include Movie Night, Science Night, Art Gallery Night, and Kindergarten Parent Night The attendance at these events is typically from 400-700 families.

We keep communication open with our families by using Remind app. for communicating which gives parents the ability to text the teacher with concerns. We also provide newsletters, phone calls, and notes home to keep parents current on student progress.

At Lipscomb Elementary we strive to make our students, parents, and guests feel welcomed and respected.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.