Sky Academy Englewood

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

Demographics

Principal: John Bailey

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	6%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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

N/A

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

Sky Academy Englewood

871 S RIVER RD, Englewood, FL 34223

www.skyatthey.com

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	8%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	23%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

SKY Academy's mission is to promote student achievement through an infusion of rigorous academic,wellness and fitness strategies incorporated into the learning and mastery of the Florida State Standards.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sky Academy's vision is to develop a Middle School that is highly regarded for its academic excellence, through the building of strong bodies and in developing an understanding of the importance of wellness and nutrition for academic 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
Bailey, John	Principal	Responsible for overseeing all aspects of the school including academic and operations.
Forcier, Patricia	Assistant Principal	Assists in overseeing all aspects of the school.
Jaques, Liz	Teacher, K-12	Teachings ELA and is a member of the school leadership team.
Decato-Flaherty, Kara	School Counselor	Health and Wellbeing of students on campus

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 8/1/2015, John Bailey

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.*
6

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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
18

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	6%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	85	82	100	0	0	0	0	267
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	0	0	0	0	18

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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

Tuesday 9/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	107	99	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	17	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	19	0	0	0	0	42

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	16	0	0	0	0	27

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	107	99	0	0	0	0	293
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	17	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	19	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	8	16	0	0	0	0	27

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	1	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	

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	61%	64%	54%	70%	62%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	58%	54%	69%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	47%	63%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	73%	74%	58%	75%	71%	56%
Math Learning Gains	63%	66%	57%	72%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	51%	69%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	51%	61%	51%	58%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	85%	72%	0%	91%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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	63%	63%	0%	54%	9%
	2018	60%	63%	-3%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	64%	-6%	52%	6%
	2018	68%	62%	6%	51%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	62%	66%	-4%	56%	6%
	2018	74%	70%	4%	58%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	71%	67%	4%	55%	16%
	2018	61%	66%	-5%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	73%	-15%	54%	4%
	2018	56%	73%	-17%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
08	2019	88%	65%	23%	46%	42%
	2018	80%	63%	17%	45%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	49%	62%	-13%	48%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	62%	-11%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	85%	-3%	71%	11%
2018	79%	80%	-1%	71%	8%
Compare		3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	73%	27%	61%	39%
2018	94%	77%	17%	62%	32%
Compare		6%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	23	41	40	38	47	53					
HSP	69	46		62	48						
WHT	61	52	51	75	65	62	53	83	84		

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	56	51	52	57	47	27					
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	32	57	63	42	68	93					
HSP	46	54		64	73						
WHT	67	61	62	71	66	74	50	80	87		
FRL	37	37	55	46	63						
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	52	61		48	67	55					
HSP	69	58		69	75						
WHT	69	69	65	76	73	65	57		68		
FRL	55	55		73	82						

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	64
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
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	56
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
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	65
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	48
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.

Subgroups for SWD achievement levels for ELA and math proficiency are the lowest performing category across all Assessment data. The school had an increased number of students identified as SWD and needed to add additional instructional supports for the students.

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

Learning gains for math dropped from 73% in 2018 to 58% in 2019. This is largely due to changes in staffing that occurred during the school year within the seventh grade class.

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 Learning gains scores 3% below the state average. One factor is the increase in students with disabilities receiving services to meet their needs.

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

Cohort increase in mathematics proficiency from grade 7 to grade 8 was 32% in 2019. This is the result of strong instruction aligned to pacing guides and progress monitored throughout the year with the use of I-ready diagnostics.

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

There are 10 students in the school who have a history of attendance rates below 90%. This is a concern because it represents approximately 5% of the student population having a greater than 10% absenteeism rate.

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

1. Increase proficiency rates for SWD's in ELA and Math
2. Increase learning gains for math within the lowest quartile
3. Reduce the number of students with less than 90% attendance rates.
4. Increase Science proficiency rates

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD Students from the school year 2019 had a proficiency rate of 23% in ELA. This represented a 10% drop from the previous years state assessment scores and contributed to the overall drop in ELA proficiency rates across the school.
Measurable Outcome:	SKY Academy Englewood SWD will increase their proficiency rate on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in ELA from 23% to 28%. \
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kara Decato-Flaherty (kara.decato-flaherty@skyatthey.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of an Intensive ELA Class to support additional instruction for low performing SWD. Progress monitoring will be completed on a quarterly basis through the use of i-ready.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who are not performing at a proficient level on state assessments need additional time to address gaps in learning as well as support in on-grade level instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify SWD with low performing FSA scores
2. Review reporting categories for gaps in learning
3. Schedule students for daily intensive ELA class\
4. Progress monitor using I-ready and IXL
5. Develop an individualized learning plan to support individual students according to their unique gaps.

Person Responsible	Kara Decato-Flaherty (kara.decato-flaherty@skyatthey.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile group in mathematics in grades 6-8
Measurable Outcome:	Sky Academy Englewood will increase the percentage of lowest quartile students who make learning gains on the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) in Mathematics from 58% to 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia Forcier (patricia.forcier@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	IXL and I-Ready diagnostic, progress monitoring and intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will utilize the iready and IXL programs for diagnostic and intervention purposes. Program will identify areas of weaknesses and target instructional pathways along the different reporting categories.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students take i-ready diagnostics
2. Students conference with their teachers and set goals
3. A learning pathway is developed for each student to address gaps in learning
4. Teacher monitors progress on a bi-weekly basis
5. Follow up progress monitoring through i-ready will be conducted and the data analyzed for growth
6. Student pathway is redefined at each window.

Person Responsible	Patricia Forcier (patricia.forcier@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Attendance for all students in both the traditional and the remote learning modes is critical to student success in school.
Measurable Outcome:	SKY Academy Englewood will maintain the number of students who have less than 90% attendance rates.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia Forcier (patricia.forcier@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement a monitoring program through the homeroom teachers..
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students who have adults on the campus who care for them and monitor their attendance are more likely to be addressed as the attendance issues arise.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor attendance rate on a bi-weekly basis via homeroom teachers
2. Mail home attendance notices for students accruing excessive absences
3. Parent contact/conference for students accruing more than 10 absences in a term
4. Student referrals to School Wide Support Team (SWST) to establish an action plan for student
5. Progress monitor action plan with updated parent contact as needed

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Science continues to be an area that need to be addressed. Changing in staffing within the school each year has made this a challenge. Three new teachers within the campus mean we will again be working on developing quality instruction aligned with standards.

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.

SKY is in the development stage of a new PBIS program focused around the positive actions of the students in our school. This incentive program will recognize student for exhibiting qualities within the seven wellnesses. Instruction on the meanings behind the wellnesses and how they impact our daily lives occurs within homeroom settings on a weekly basis.
Homeroom time built into the schedule to address SEL curriculum needs and aligned to SKY Academy's 7 wellnesses: Social, Occupational, Spiritual, Physical, Intellectual, Emotional and Environmental.
Guidance is in it's second year on the campus to address student needs as individuals.
Anonymous reporting apps (Fortify Florida and STOPit!) have added to the school for students to report incidents of bullying, social concerns, safety and threats.
Teambuilding and collective collaboration activities are implemented in instruction when appropriate.
New groups / Lunch Bunches are held with groups of students focused on specific topics (grief, social skills, communication, etc).
Aftercare program developed to include more interactive opportunities for students to socialize appropriately through games and activities.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00