Douglas Anderson School Of The Arts

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Douglas Anderson School Of The Arts

2445 SAN DIEGO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/anderson

Demographics

Principal: Tina Wilson

Start Date for this Principal: 4/17/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	32%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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

Douglas Anderson School Of The Arts

2445 SAN DIEGO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/anderson

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)
High School 9-12	No	20%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

Douglas Anderson School of the Arts will be the leading public arts high school in the nation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Where Arts and Academics Meet in Excellence

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
Hammer, Melanie	Principal	
Cinotti, Jacquelyn	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and Scheduling
Cowgill, Patti	Teacher, ESE	Fully Released VE Teacher
Lamp, Bonnie	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Teacher
Sproch-Boyd, Tammy	Dean	Dean of Students
Franklin, Jeremy	Assistant Principal	Curriculum

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 4/17/2017, Tina Wilson

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
57

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	32%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (69%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	297	282	329	262	1170
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	3	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4	24
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	41	32	11	122
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	24	22	15	130

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	45	59	64	41	209

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	1	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

Monday 7/27/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	282	337	281	289	1190
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
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	10	3	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	4	1	29

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	20	18	13	11	62

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	1	0	0	5	6	12
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	0	0	1	282	337	281	289	1190
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
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	10	3	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	13	4	1	29

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	20	18	13	11	62

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	1	0	0	5	6	12
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	86%	47%	56%	85%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	48%	51%	63%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	42%	42%	62%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	80%	51%	51%	70%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	63%	52%	48%	48%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	47%	45%	34%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	97%	65%	68%	99%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	70%	73%	88%	64%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	85%	48%	37%	55%	30%
	2018	84%	48%	36%	53%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	87%	48%	39%	53%	34%
	2018	89%	49%	40%	53%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	97%	67%	30%	67%	30%
2018	95%	63%	32%	65%	30%
Compare	2%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	68%	24%	70%	22%
2018	92%	64%	28%	68%	24%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	69%	57%	12%	61%	8%
2018	75%	61%	14%	62%	13%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	61%	23%	57%	27%
2018	80%	57%	23%	56%	24%
Compare		4%			

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	58	51	50	44	42	23	92	71		100	60
ASN	87	57						100			
BLK	68	62	60	61	53	42	95	82		100	65
HSP	81	60	69	82	62		97	97		100	75
MUL	90	68		62	36		95	92			
WHT	92	75	80	91	71	87	98	95		99	86
FRL	78	61	65	71	61	52	93	92		100	66
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	60	67	59	61	79		83	63		93	57
ASN	100	75						100		100	95
BLK	69	60	62	61	49	52	90	85		100	78
HSP	85	73	69	76	54		89	95		100	76
MUL	85	72		73	69						
WHT	92	72	70	85	62	63	99	94		99	84
FRL	78	64	63	71	50	55	95	86		98	72
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	63	55	43	44	38			69			

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
ASN	85	63		80	50		100	80			
BLK	71	57	54	51	41	21	96	83		98	60
HSP	81	50	50	55	40	15	95	74		100	67
MUL	82	50		61	35		100			100	91
WHT	90	68	71	77	51	45	99	92		99	74
FRL	81	64	62	61	41	24	95	81		98	57

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	80
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	802
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	69
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	80
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	74
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	87
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	74
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.

Algebra I showed the lowest performance in 2019. Both the District and the State scores for Algebra I decreased in 2019. DA had more students enrolled in Algebra I than in previous years.

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

Algebra I showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Both the District and the State scores for Algebra I decreased in 2019. DA had more students enrolled in Algebra I than in previous years.

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.

All of our scores are well above the state average in each tested subject.

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

US History, Geometry, and Biology all increased by 4 points over the previous year. In Geometry and Biology, we added student assistants to work with small groups of students on standards that needed remediation. Administrators also had small groups of students they worked with to remediate weak standards.

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

Attendance - we have many students who have less than 90% attendance
Level 1 - It appears we have more level 1 students this year than in previous years.

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

1. Increasing Algebra 1 Proficiency
2. Learning Gains in Math
3. Learning Gains in ELA
4. Decreasing the number of students who have attended school less than 90% of the time

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will participate in effective common planning that focuses on aligned tasks, assessments, and equivalent experiences. Based on the Standards-Based Walkthroughs during the 2019-2020 school year, the slight majority of classrooms showed focus boards with aligned standards and implemented assessments that were strongly aligned to the standards being taught.
Measurable Outcome:	The vast majority of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-aligned planning, instruction and assessment practices.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Facilitate and monitor PLC and common planning that results in assessments that are aligned with the standards being taught in the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students engage with standards-aligned and course-appropriate instruction, scores improve, and learning gains increase. Students need to be regularly exposed to standards-based assessments to be adequately prepared for end of course state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Conduct professional development on standards-based planning, delivery, and assessment.

Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)

Schedule and support PLCs and Common Planning.

Person Responsible	Jacquelyn Cinotti (cinottij@duvalschools.org)

Continue Standards-Based Walkthroughs and weekly Friday Admin Meetings to discuss findings and trends and identify actionable next steps.

Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)

Analyze data (PMAs, Achieve3000, classroom assessments, etc.)

Person Responsible	Jeremy Franklin (franklinj3@duvalschools.org)

The PLCs will unpack the standards and work through the Learning Arc Document to ensure alignment with instruction and assessment.

Person Responsible	Jacquelyn Cinotti (cinottij@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity		
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will build a culture of inclusivity and equity by educating all stakeholders, opening channels of dialogue and reviewing curriculum, school practices, and perspectives. Based on stakeholder feedback, current culture, and world events, we identified the area of equity and diversity as a cultural priority for the 2020-2021 school year. Students learn best when they feel safe and accepted.
Measurable Outcome:	All of our students will feel safe and accepted at Douglas Anderson.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Diversity and equity in curriculum and staff will ensure that students are exposed to a diverse range of cultures and experiences. Building a culture of inclusivity and equity will allow us to attract a more diverse student body as well as a more diverse faculty and staff. When all students are supported by the faculty and staff on our campus, scores in academic areas will increase.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that students must feel safe and accepted before they can focus on their learning goals.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide professional development for all faculty and staff provided by DCPS and outside experts.	
Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)
Work with Ulysses Owens, DA Artist in Residence, to review all arts curriculum to ensure diversity and inclusivity across all of our 10 arts areas.	
Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)
Create a DA Integrity Statement that all students will sign and uphold.	
Person Responsible	Tammy Sproch-Boyd (sproch-bot@duvalschools.org)
Work with outside agencies to assist in the recruitment and retention of more diverse faculty and staff.	
Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)
Create a Student Culture Advisory Group for the school and for each of our 10 arts areas.	
Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)
Work with the DA Task Force, which includes alumni, students, and parents, to share ideas, strategies and Best Practices to improve culture.	
Person Responsible	Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance is being addressed through the Integrity Statement. We will also ensure AIT meetings are held and follow-up provided for students who have excessive absences.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We have created a Douglas Anderson Culture Advisory Group made up of current students to advise on culture-related concerns at DA. Each arts area will create a student advisory groups to advise on culture, equity, and diversity within the arts area.

The DA Task Force is comprised of DA Alumni, current students, and parents to act as a liaison between the school and the various stakeholder groups.

Ulysses Owens, Artist in Residence at DA, is helping to create a team of artists to help review arts curriculum to ensure diversity, equity, and inclusivity in the arts programs at DA.

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