Mayport Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mayport Elementary School

2753 SHANGRI LA DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayport

Demographics

Principal: Katie Oconnell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	[Cassandra Brusca](#)
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 Duval 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

Mayport Elementary School

2753 SHANGRI LA DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayport

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 PK-5	No	79%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in middle school and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Engage, encourage and educate our students and families by creating hands-on opportunities to explore the world around us.

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
O'Connell, Katie	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing curriculum, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support school and district goals, and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities, and leads the Instructional Leadership Team.
Thomas, Dione	Assistant Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing curriculum, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support school and district goals, and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities, and leads the Instructional Leadership Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Katie Oconnell

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.*
24

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
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: B (54%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	84	99	90	79	74	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	16	17	7	12	15	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	27	52	42	22	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	33	68	52	40	19	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	224

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	28	50	35	21	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/5/2020

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	86	104	94	83	82	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	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		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	86	104	94	83	82	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	58%	50%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	56%	58%	60%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	50%	53%	68%	54%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	62%	62%	63%	80%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	60%	63%	62%	85%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	52%	51%	83%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	68%	48%	53%	58%	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	58%	51%	7%	58%	0%
	2018	68%	50%	18%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison	-10%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	52%	6%	58%	0%
	2018	53%	49%	4%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-10%					
05	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	-16%					
Cohort Comparison	-5%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
	2018	85%	59%	26%	62%	23%
Same Grade Comparison	-34%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	64%	12%	64%	12%
	2018	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison	10%					
Cohort Comparison	-9%					
05	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
	2018	75%	61%	14%	61%	14%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-22%					
Cohort Comparison		-13%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
	2018	84%	56%	28%	55%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%					
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	42	59	40	42	62	40	54				
BLK	56	50		54	50		67				
HSP	36	25		59	33						
MUL	56	50		63	70						
WHT	62	62	43	66	66	27	66				
FRL	55	66	44	60	58	27	64				
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	45	57	54	62	59	30	88				
BLK	53	53		70	63						
HSP	56	64		78	73						
MUL	67			81							
WHT	65	58	53	81	63	38	90				
FRL	63	56	53	80	65	39	88				
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	33	37	45	64	78	85	27				
BLK	45	57	60	63	81		33				
HSP	53	73		80	91						
MUL	73	73		87	91						
WHT	58	58	82	85	83	85	71				
FRL	52	56	47	78	82	81	42				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
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	377
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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
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	55
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	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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

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

Math LPQ- Contributing factors include that grades 3rd, 4th and 5th were each 3-way splits which created larger class sizes and caused a loss of instructional time for core instruction in reading and math.

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

Science Achievement- Contributing factors include that grades 3rd, 4th and 5th were each 3-way splits which created larger class sizes and caused a loss of instructional time for core 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.

Bottom Quartile Gains in Math and Language Arts had the greatest gap when compared to the state. Contributing factors include that grades 3rd, 4th and 5th were each 3-way splits which created larger class sizes and caused a loss of instructional time for core instruction in reading and math.

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

There was a loss in each data component.

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

Hispanic students were the subgroup below 41%.

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

1. ELA LPQ Gains
2. Math LPQ Gains
3. Math Proficiency
4. Reading Proficiency
5. Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The Hispanic subgroup had an Federal Index of 38% which falls below the 41% threshold. This makes it a critical area for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	Mayport Elementary will increase the federal index for the Hispanic Subgroup by 4% bringing it to 42%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in grades K-2 will be receiving direct instruction in reading using the SRA Reading Mastery Program. Students will receive 45 minutes of intervention in reading daily. Students in grades 3-5 will receive 30 minutes of intervention daily using the LLI Program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These programs are data based intervention programs that assist struggling readers.

Action Steps to Implement	
Identify all students in the subgroup and assess their current reading level	
Person Responsible	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)
Enroll students into intervention program	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Monitor student assessment progress monthly	
Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Last year 40% of the standards walkthroughs indicated that the student task aligned to the standard. 45% of the time the student assessment aligned to the arc of the standard. This indicates that students are not being exposed to the level or rigor and alignment to the standard needed for success.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will engage in standards aligned common planning focused on standards aligned tasks and assessments. As a result of the learning, students tasks will be aligned to the standard at least 60% of the time and assessments will be aligned to the learning arc of the standard at least 65% of the time.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional delivery ensures that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Calibrate administration on standards walkthroughs. Admin team is all new to the school and new to working together. We need to ensure we are seeing instruction the same.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Create common planning agendas and tasks that allow for the teacher to plan standards focused tasks and assessments that meet the level of rigor of the standard.

Person Responsible	Dione Thomas (thomasd11@duvalschools.org)

Continue monitoring alignment of standards and assessments through Standards Focused Walkthroughs using the Standard Walkthrough tool and analyze the data weekly with the admin team.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Conduct focus walks with grade level teams quarterly to ensure grade level alignment to the standards is seen.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 5 Essentials Survey, teachers rated collaborative practices as week (36%). Teachers do not feel that they have many opportunities to observe each other or work together to create common assessments or instructional strategies. This negatively impacts alignment across grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	Core content teachers will engage in instructional rounds to observe other classrooms quarterly and provide each other with feedback on standards aligned instruction. As a result of Instructional Rounding, teachers will rate collaborative practices at least neutral on the 5 Essentials Survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Rounds gives teachers the opportunity to visit each others classrooms and gain ideas and inspiration from each others teaching. It will also allow for rich discussion about effective instructional practices and standards alignment. Providing feedback to your peers will build a collaborative environment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional Rounds are research based and help teachers gain a common understanding of what effective instruction looks like. They are a valuable tool for building a culture of collaboration.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers on Instructional Rounding and set guidelines. Have protocol for debrief and feedback.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Create a schedule to conduct instructional rounds at least quarterly with all grade levels

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Conduct instructional rounds and debrief with teachers in a structured way. Allow teachers to provide feedback to each other.

Person Responsible	Katie O'Connell (speark@duvalschools.org)

Conduct a book study on grade level teams on The 5 language of Appreciation in the Workplace. This would allow teams to build a culture of appreciation and respect.

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.

We will address the Science Improvement Priority by increase science minutes in the 5th grade. In addition, we will closely monitor student assessment data. We will work with the district science specialist to support the teacher.

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.

The school has a Sunshine Committee that engages all faculty and staff members in improving the culture and climate. This committee plans events and gatherings to engage all faculty and staff members on team building, trust building, and friendship. In addition, the school utilizes Class DoJo with all students and parents. This program allows parents and teachers to communicate easily. In addition, it allows teacher to celebrate student success and notify parents when a student is struggling with behavior. The school as a whole utilized DoJo to celebrate students with monthly DoJo awards and prize carts. The school involves parents and community members in their monthly SAC meetings to gain support from all stakeholders.

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: Hispanic	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00