

Jackson County School Board

Sneads Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Sneads Elementary School

1961 LOCKEY DR, Sneads, FL 32460

<http://ses.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Zane Walden

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-4
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Sneads Elementary School

1961 LOCKEY DR, Sneads, FL 32460

<http://ses.jcsb.org>

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-4	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/20/2020.

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.

Our Beliefs:

We believe that every student is important and can learn.

We believe that learning to read is the cornerstone for all education.

We believe that family and community involvement benefits student achievement.

We believe that continuous improvement is essential to the growth and development of both student and staff members.

We believe that a safe and secure environment is essential for teaching and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

AN EDUCATION IS LIFE'S BEST TREASURE

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
Dewitt, Steve	Principal	<p>The School Based Leadership Team members help lead their grade group in planning and instruction along with other leaderships responsibilities. Specific SLT Roles/functions (one person may surely have more than one role)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruction Leader – (Administrator, Steve DeWitt) - Ensures fidelity of the process, sets regularly scheduled times for the SLT to convene, makes decisions on how T2 and T3 services will be delivered • Team Leader – (Guidance Counselor, Brandi Perkins/Amber McIntosh/Jeannie Downum)- Directs team activities, receives referrals for the SLT, informs staff/parents, sets mtg times, ensures the proper documentation is maintained, and sets dates/times for follow-up meetings • Data Mentor – (Brandi Perkins) Assists in collecting, organizing, visually displaying, analyzing and interpreting data • Staff Liaison – (Steve DeWitt, Brandi Perkins, Amber McIntosh, Jeannie Downum)Key communicator with staff, establishes procedures to gain staff input and collaboration with other school initiatives • Content Specialist – (Amber McIntosh, Brandi Perkins, Jeannie Downum) Assists in making key decisions about instructional needs of struggling students, identifies evidenced-based interventions most likely to be effective in addressing the area of concern, and provides training/consultation as needed • Record Keeper – (Amber McIntosh, Brandi Perkins, Jeannie Downum) Documents/completes required paperwork in the meetings, serves as timekeeper, informs team when time is running short. • Behavior Specialist – Assists in identifying function of problem behaviors and developing Behavior Intervention Plans, collaborates and provides training as needed • Teacher – of the student whose needs are being addressed • Parent/Guardian – of the student whose needs are being addressed • Speech/Language Pathologist –as needed–assists in developing interventions for speech/language concerns-provides training as needed to interventionists <p>The SLT collaborates with other school-based teams such as SAC, literacy leadership teams, grade group teams, the positive behavior support team, and other professional learning teams to analyze</p>
McIntosh, Amber	Administrative Support	
Edwards, Kerrienne	Teacher, K-12	
Perkins, Brandi	School Counselor	
Downum, Jeannie	Teacher, K-12	

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jones, Monica	Teacher, K-12	
Nable, Lorie	Teacher, K-12	
Dickson, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Carpenter, Lindy	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Zane Walden

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.*

5

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-4
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (73%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	104	120	96	99	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	10	3	6	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	18	14	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	4	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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	122	123	103	84	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	29	32	25	25	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	2	7	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	26	26	18	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	18	34	13	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	26	26	18	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Students retained two or more times	0	3	10	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	104	120	96	99	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	11	13	10	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	2	9	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	6	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	3	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	18	14	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	4	6	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	75%	63%	57%	73%	65%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	58%	58%	62%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	49%	53%	54%	58%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	66%	63%	87%	71%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	58%	62%	63%	65%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	45%	51%	57%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	54%	53%	77%	61%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)					Total
	K	1	2	3	4	
	(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	71%	58%	13%	58%	13%
	2018	80%	66%	14%	57%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	62%	17%	58%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	77%	66%	11%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	89%	70%	19%	62%	27%
	2018	98%	72%	26%	62%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	71%	19%	64%	26%
	2018	91%	72%	19%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State 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	49	41		76	56						
BLK	50	47		67	56						
HSP	82			100							
MUL	75			83							
WHT	80	69	82	93	79	83					
FRL	74	67	67	87	74	73					
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	62	57	42	72	60	36	56				
BLK	59	62	50	74	69	60	47				
HSP	70			100							
WHT	81	74	68	94	77	70	83				
FRL	69	69	63	86	76	63	61				

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	60	46	33	67	54	43	45				
BLK	54	48	33	75	46	40	50				
WHT	79	67	68	90	68	65	84				
FRL	64	55	56	84	62	59	73				

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	75
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	452
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
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	
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	91
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	79
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	81
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.

ELA students in bottom 25% with disabilities performed the lowest. Yes, this is a trend according to our last few years of data. Our area of the state was hit by a category 5 hurricane and missed several instructional days for this particular year of data, which might have been a contributing factor. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the suspension of testing, our most recent data was from 2019.

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

ELA students in the bottom 25% dropped from 57 to 41. Our area of the state was hit by a category 5 hurricane and missed several instructional days, which might have been a contributing factor for that year's data. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the suspension of testing, our most recent data was from 2019.

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.

We are currently above the state in all areas. ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile both are 15 points above the state average. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the suspension of testing, our most recent data was from 2019.

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

We are currently above the state average in all areas. ELA Learning Gains were 8 points above the state average and ELA lowest 25th percentile were 17 points above the state average. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the suspension of testing, our most recent data was from 2019.

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

Achievement declines, but Learning Gains went up. Our school was combined with another school in our district, and this may have possibly played a part in our achievement declining for that particular year. Also, due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the suspension of testing, our most recent data was from 2019.

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

1. Improve ELA proficiency
2. Improve Math proficiency
3. Monitor SWD learning gains
4. Monitor learning gains of subgroups

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Proficiency went down from 77% to 75%. Achievement gap between white and black students is 30%.
Measurable Outcome:	Sneads Elementary will increase student proficiency by 1%, student learning gains by 5%, and learning gains of the lowest 25% students by 1%. The achievement gap between white and black students will decrease by 5% as a result of the 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiating Instruction 2. Additional staff 3. Supplemental Curriculum
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Differentiating is proven effective in supporting SWD students and improving overall growth as part of the MTSS process. 2. Additional staff is needed to ensure tier 2 interventions meet the teacher or paraprofessional to student ratio 3. Supplemental Curriculum is used in preparation for statewide assessments

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small group for Lowest 25%
2. Tier 3 RTI instruction with a reading endorsed teacher
3. Tier 2 RTI instruction with a Title 1 paraprofessional
4. i-Ready program
5. Coachbooks...
6. Training
7. RTI meetings
8. IEP meetings

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Proficiency went down from 91% to 88%. Achievement gap between white and black students is 26%.

Measurable Outcome: Sneads Elementary will increase student proficiency by 1% and decrease achievement gap between white and black students by 8%. The learning gains for students will be 78% and learning gains for the lowest 25% of students will be 77% based on 2021 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiating instruction
2. Additional staff
3. Supplemental Curriculum

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Differentiating is proven effective in supporting SWD students and improving overall growth as part of the MTSS process.
2. Additional staff is needed to ensure tier 2 and tier 3 interventions meet the teacher or paraprofessional to student ratio
3. Supplemental Curriculum is used in preparation for statewide assessments

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small group for Lowest 25%
2. Tier 3 RTI instruction in the classroom
3. Tier 2 RTI instruction with a Title 1 paraprofessional
4. i-Ready program
5. Coachbooks...
6. Training
7. RTI meetings
8. IEP meetings

Person Responsible Steve Dewitt (steve.dewitt@jcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance**Student Behaviors****Watchlist for students**

Increasing parent involvement when possible with Covid guidelines

Monthly data days to discuss student performance and needs

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.

Since parents are an integral part of their child's educational team, they are invited and encouraged to attend any and all activities at Sneads Elementary, such as parent conferences, the annual Title 1 Meeting, PTO meetings, Open House, Grade Level Orientation, School Advisory Council Meetings, field trips, class parties, fall and spring carnivals, Field Day, and special programs that include; Kindergarten and Fifth grade graduation, Thanksgiving Feast, Grandparent's Day, Muffins with Mom, Donuts with Dad, Kindergarten Pow Wow, Gingerbread Houses in Kindergarten, and Writing With Your Child. A positive and safe school culture is always at the forefront of the choices made for our school. We welcome all stakeholders to be involved in all of our school functions, as well as our day to day activities when possible with current guidelines that might be in place. Our goal is to always have a great rapport with all of our stakeholders, as they are a vital part of our school culture.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00