

Duval County Public Schools

North Shore Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Shore Elementary

5701 SILVER PLZ, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/northshore>

Demographics

Principal: Felicia Hardaway

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

North Shore Elementary

5701 SILVER PLZ, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/northshore>

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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	95%

School Grades History

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

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.

North Shore's mission is to provide educational excellence in EVERY school, in EVERY classroom, for EVERY student, EVERY day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of North Shore Elementary School is to inspire and prepare students to be successful in college or a career.

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
Hardaway, Felicia	Principal	
Baker-Madden, Jamia	Assistant Principal	
Robinson, Laura	Instructional Coach	
Daniels, Toni	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Felicia Hardaway

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (52%) 2017-18: C (50%) 2016-17: C (52%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

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	150	142	145	169	168	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	56	55	52	66	62	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
One or more suspensions	9	16	23	34	43	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	119	114	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351

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	52	75	76	99	95	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494

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	1	4	4	10	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	150	142	145	169	168	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	927
Attendance below 90 percent	56	55	52	66	62	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	335
One or more suspensions	9	16	23	34	43	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	169
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	119	114	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	351

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	52	75	76	99	95	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494

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	1	4	4	10	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	41%	50%	57%	35%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	58%	50%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	50%	53%	53%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	62%	63%	63%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	63%	62%	65%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	52%	51%	67%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	48%	53%	32%	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	38%	51%	-13%	58%	-20%
	2018	41%	50%	-9%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	31%	49%	-18%	56%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	35%	50%	-15%	56%	-21%
	2018	31%	51%	-20%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	61%	13%	62%	12%
	2018	59%	59%	0%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	44%	57%	-13%	60%	-16%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	61%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	49%	-14%	53%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	27%	56%	-29%	55%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	28	58	47	40	52	54	25				
BLK	39	48	56	62	60	58	32				
MUL	50			79							
WHT	57	83		78	50		73				
FRL	41	51	54	65	59	59	39				
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	20	54	75	28	47	35	18				
BLK	34	51	76	52	55	50	24				
WHT	45	55		68	70		50				
FRL	37	52	77	54	58	51	28				
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	10	36	36	29	18						
BLK	33	48	53	62	66	68	28				
WHT	48	65		62	58						
FRL	34	49	54	63	65	69	30				

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	52
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	367

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	51
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	65
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	68
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 used to guide this plan was taken from 2019 data. Reading proficiency and gains showed the lowest performance. Although, proficiency is the highest it has been in my 9 year tenure, it's still in the bottom 300 schools. Science proficiency increased; however, it is still significantly low.

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

This data was used to guide this plan was taken from 2019. Reading LPQ's showed the greatest decline. This is attributed to staff promotion and mid-year promotion. The staff that replaced the veteran teacher was a novice teacher from primary. 3rd grade students were promoted mid-year to 4th grade. Gains decreased from LPQ gains 78% to 64%.

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.

According to the 2019 data, the greatest gap is Reading/ELA. North Shore's proficiency is 41% and the state's proficiency is 58%

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

According to the 2019 data, the area that showed the most improvement was reading proficiency, increasing by 6 points. This was not a trend being that reading proficiency usually increases 1-2% or stays the same; and has never been higher than 35%.

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

The two potential areas of concern are attendance (students missing more than 90 days).. and the number of students with suspensions.

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

1. Reading
2. Math
3. Science
4. Attendance
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus will be to increase reading proficiency and reading gains. After data analysis of the 2019 data, proficiency increased in reading; however, gains declined. The previous year, gains increased and proficiency maintained. We need a balance that will enable us to increase reading proficiency as well as gains simultaneously.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome is to increase reading proficiency to 45% and reading gains to 65%. We will do this by monitoring standards-based instruction (delivery), implement reading strategies through Reading Mastery and Corrective Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Felicia Hardaway (hardawayf@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will monitor the teachers' planning and lesson plans for unpacking standards using the KUDs strategies as well as teacher instruction using the standards-based walk-through tool, iReady and Achieve 300 data/tool kits, and corrective and reading reading mastery data. Teachers will participate in PD based on needs as well as attend weekly common planning that will be monitored by administration/instructional coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies were chosen because they are district vetted strategies and curricular.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PD for KUDs
2. Analyzing data
3. Common planning
4. Implement reading strategies (corrective and reading mastery)
5. The following positions will be funded through Title 1 to provide additional support for students in instruction: paras, media specialist, and reading coach.
6. Before, after-school, and Saturday school tutoring will funded through Title 1 to provide additional tutoring for our students. PD for KUDs

Person Responsible Laura Robinson (cruzl@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus will be to increase proficiency in math and math gains. After data analysis of the 2019 data, proficiency and gains increased in math; however, gains was by only 3-6 points... We need a balance that will enable us to increase math proficiency as well as gains simultaneously in double-digit numbers.

Measurable Outcome: The outcome is to increase math proficiency to 65% and math gains to 65%. We will do this by monitoring standards-based instruction (delivery), implementing math strategies and strategies through math camp (Acaletics)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Felicia Hardaway (hardawayf@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will monitor the teachers' planning and lesson plans for unpacking standards using the KUDs strategies as well as teacher instruction using the standards-based walk-through tool, iReady data/tool kits, and Acaletics data. Teachers will participate in PD based on needs as well as attend weekly common planning that will be monitored by administration/ instructional coaches.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies were chosen because they are district vetted strategies and curricular.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PD for KUDs
2. Analyzing data
3. Common planning
4. Implement math strategies (Acaletics)
5. The following positions will be funded through Title 1 to provide additional support for students in instruction: paras, media specialist, and reading coach.
6. Before, after-school, and Saturday school tutoring will funded through Title 1 to provide additional tutoring for our students.

Person Responsible Jamia Baker-Madden (baker-madj@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus is on student attendance and tardies. After data analysis of the 2019 data, we found that students that fell in the LPQ category were kids that missed a considerable number of days (10 or more) per nine week and/or quarter and had excessive tardies year after year.

Measurable Outcome: To decrease the number of students with 10 or more absences, suspensions and tardies by 85-90%, in turn increasing student achievement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Toni Daniels (danielst1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: ALL LPQ students (and students with excessive absences/tardies) will be tracked and monitored bi-weekly. Parents will be contacted and an AIT meeting will be held along with the truant officer that could potentially be sent to the state attorney's office.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The reason for selecting this particular strategy is to increase the students' that perform in the LPQ category attendance. If students are prompt and present, they are able to learn. Students will be assigned to teachers as a check-in/check-out bi-weekly mentoring program... asking probing questions that let's the students know "Hey, I care about you and your well-being. I miss you when you aren't here"

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze student attendance data
2. Track students bi-weekly
3. Implement attendance contracts as needed
4. Calm classrooms
5. Mentoring plan

Person Responsible Toni Daniels (danielst1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school-wide leadership team will monitor all action steps. We will meet bi-weekly to address academic needs as well as school safety, behavior through PBIS, and attendance through AIT.

Title 1 funds will fund professional development to provide professional development as needed to help build student achievement.

Additional resource material will be purchased through Title 1 for reading, math and science to help enrich students academically.

In addition, students will have field trip opportunities that will expose them to real-world and life experiences that support the curriculum and standards based instruction to Sea World, World of Nations, etc.

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 will increase parental involvement by having 1 parent night per nine week that will address reading, math and science. Parents will also participate in SAC and PTA.

Parents will log into FOCUS and Class Dojo to maintain communication with their student's teachers.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.