Fishweir Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fishweir Elementary School

3977 HERSCHEL ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

http://www.duvalschools.org/fishweir

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Dennis M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

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)	47%
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 (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (67%) 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

Fishweir Elementary School

3977 HERSCHEL ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

http://www.duvalschools.org/fishweir

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	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

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.

Fishweir Elementary School is a standards-based learning community where the individual needs of the student are assessed and the results are used to direct our instruction. The child-centered curriculum encourages children to grow academically and creatively. The academic and arts curriculum focuses on strengthening communication skills, fostering creative problem solving skills and enabling our students to exhibit exemplary interpersonal skills to become productive lifelong learners that will enrich their lives and our society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Fishweir Elementary School, we strive for excellence, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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
Dennis, Kimberly	Principal	The Principal's job and responsibilities include monitoring instruction, analyzing student data (cognitive and non-cognitive), providing individualized and prescriptive professional development for teachers and support staff members. In addition to these responsibilities, the principal is responsible for increasing student achievement, ensuring managerial operations are effective and consistent. The Principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members with securing business partners.
Smith, Latoya	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal's job and responsibilities include monitoring instruction, analyzing student data (cognitive and non-cognitive), providing individualized and prescriptive professional development for teachers and support staff members. In addition to these responsibilities, the principal is responsible for increasing student achievement, ensuring managerial operations are effective and consistent. The Assistant Principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members with securing business partners.
Black, Amy	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor's job and responsibilities include providing counseling support to students, teaching classroom guidance lessons, facilitating MT meetings, provide crisis intervention, provide A.L.E.R.T. training to staff, processing referrals (i.e. gifted, 504, speech).
Brantley, Katherine	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Lead Teacher's job and responsibilities include supporting the other VE Resource teacher, working collaboratively with general education teachers to support students, servicing Inclusion students, developing IEPs, providing accommodations for students based on their IEP, serving as the LEA Liaison.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/3/2020, Kimberly Dennis M

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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)	47%
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 (66%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (67%) 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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	91	69	73	71	74	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	12	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	91	69	73	71	74	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	0	10	12	5	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	80%	50%	57%	77%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	56%	58%	69%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	50%	53%	62%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	62%	63%	83%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	62%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	52%	51%	41%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	48%	53%	74%	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	81%	51%	30%	58%	23%
	2018	82%	50%	32%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	52%	25%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	49%	34%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	82%	50%	32%	56%	26%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	61%	23%	62%	22%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	86%	59%	27%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	64%	12%	64%	12%
	2018	88%	60%	28%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
Cohort Comparison	-10%					
05	2019	90%	57%	33%	60%	30%
	2018	70%	61%	9%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison	20%					
Cohort Comparison	2%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	49%	28%	53%	24%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison	3%					
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	50	40	27	68	55	42					
BLK	63	40		68	64	30	60				
HSP	94			94							
WHT	83	71	48	85	62	43	80				
FRL	66	50	48	71	47	26	65				
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	41	33	50	26	13	43				
BLK	65	61	36	76	39						
HSP	75			85							
MUL	83	50		83	60						
WHT	79	62	55	81	60	50	80				
FRL	67	56	41	77	56	50	67				

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	46	37	35	54	38	29					
BLK	58	68	57	69	68	45	57				
HSP	73			82							
WHT	82	68	56	88	60	39	80				
FRL	66	68	67	77	60	41	66				

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	66
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	460
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	54
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	94
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	67
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is the "Math Lowest 25th Percentile", which was 42%. The students who were identified as LPQ (lower performing quartile) students did not make adequate progress in Math. These students usually require frequent remediation and qualify for safety nets, such as before/after school tutoring, small group instruction and one-on-one support from our VE Resource teachers as well as our classroom teachers.

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance is the "Math Lowest 25th Percentile", which was 42%. The students who were identified as LPQ (lower performing quartile) students did not make adequate progress in Math. These students usually require frequent remediation and qualify for safety nets, such as before/after school tutoring, small group instruction and one-on-one support from our VE Resource teachers as well as our classroom teachers. Factors that contributed to this decline are: Students not mastering the rigorous standards; Not having adequate supplemental resources that are researched based (such as Freckles).

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.

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is "Science Achievement". The factors that contributed to this gap are 3rd and 4th Grade teachers who consistently taught Science lessons and standards with fidelity. This was evident by the 5th Grade students' performance on the baseline, PMAs and FCAT 2.0. The 5th Grade FCAT 2.0 scores are consistently about 70% proficiency each year.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is "Math Learning Gains" with a 5% point increase. Weekly, consistent and prescriptive progress monitoring occurred to determine which students needed remediation in each standard/benchmark. The content area teachers as well as the VE Resource teachers worked collaboratively to review assessments, classwork and small group instruction to determine if the prescriptive strategies for these students were successful.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data, one area of concern is absenteeism. Administration and School Counselor will continue to conduct monthly AIT (Attendance Intervention Team) meetings with parents, to discuss strategies to help parents improve their child's attendance. The District's Truant Officer is also involved to provide support to parents. The School Counselor monitors absenteeism weekly and provides updates to the Leadership Team.

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

1. Increasing the percentage of students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ) in Math for FSA.
2. Increasing the percentage of students who are in the Lower Performing Quartile (LPQ) in Reading

for FSA.
3. Increasing the percentage of Learning Gains in Math for FSA.
4. Increase the percentage of Learning Gains in Reading for FSA.
5. Increase the proficiency in 4th Grade Reading for FSA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This area of focus is "Assessing Student Learning". This area impacts student learning because teachers need to plan and create lessons that are rigorous and aligned to standards. With doing this, teachers will be able to determine mastery for that specific standard, by using the Learning Arc. Using the Learning Arc, teachers will be able to unpack standards to decide what lessons what will be taught. But most importantly, teachers will be able to determine what students need to know to master that standard.
Measurable Outcome:	When looking at the area of "Assessing Student Learning", assessments will be aligned in 50% or more of all classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kimberly Dennis (dennisk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use the Learning Arc to unpack standards, create and plan lessons that are aligned to standards. These lessons will demonstrate to teachers if students mastered that particular standard and will assess their learning. Teachers will use District developed assessments. However, teachers can also revise these assessments based on the need to further align them if necessary. If students score 70% or higher on these assessments, this will be the evidence that these assessments are aligned.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is the need to increase teachers' understanding of the Learning Arc and how it is vital and relevant to planning lessons, developing assessments and using those assessments to determine mastery of the standards. When using the Learning Arc, teachers will become skilled in going through the seven steps of unpacking each standard and planning with the end in mind. Once teachers successfully complete this process through their delivery of instruction, students will be able to produce learning tasks that not only align to the standards, but also determine mastery. This will then demonstrate alignment to FSA (test item specifications and Achievement Level Descriptors (ALDs).

Action Steps to Implement

*Teachers will meet weekly in Common Planning sessions/PLCs using the Learning Arc to guide discussion and lesson planning for unpacking standards.
*Teachers will use the curriculum guides to assist in the development of assessments that will determine if students mastered that standard, once assessed.
*Teachers will assess students and determine which students need remediation based on those results.
*Teachers will analyze the results of these assessments and determine if these assessments work.
*Teachers will create small groups for remediation who score below 70% on those assessments.
*Teachers will then re-teach that standard to that group of students and re-assess those students, to determine mastery.
*Students scoring below 70% will be taught new strategies for that standard.
*Students who score 70% or above, will receive new instruction for a new standard.
*Teachers will use Checks for Understanding.
*Teachers will be given TDEs on a continuous basis to ensure there is dedicated and uninterrupted time for using the Learning Arc for planning and developing assessments.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Dennis (dennisk@duvalschools.org)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The Leadership Team will focus on increasing the proficiency of LPQ students in Math and Reading, that is outlined in the Needs Assessment/Analysis section of the School Improvement Plan.

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.

Needs to be completed

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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00