Eastside Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Eastside Elementary School

201 ARROYO AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=11&sc_id=1171294169

Demographics

Principal: Denise Gibson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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

Eastside Elementary School

201 ARROYO AVE, Clewiston, FL 33440

http://hendry-schools.org/education/school/school.php?sectionid=11&sc_id=1171294169

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	87%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hendry 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.

Eastside Elementary will lead by example to develop character and competence in every student.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eastside support today's learners to become tomorrow community leaders.

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
Sanchez, Sara	Principal	Sarah Sanchez, Principal sanchezs@hendry-schools.net Denise Gibson, Dean of Students gibsond@hendry-schools.net Melissa Gonzalez, Guidance Counselor gonzalezme@hendry-schools.net Ingrid Gutierrez, PreK gutierrezi@hendry-schools.net Sherry Irey, Kindergarten ireys@hendry-schools.net Dara Balatico , First Grade baliaticod@hendry-schools.net Taylor Massey, Second Grade masseyt@hendry-schools.net Kristin Mann, Third Grade mannk@hendry-schools.net Monica White , Fourth Grade whitem@hendry-schools.net Tammy Mitchell, Fifth Team mitchellt@hendry-schools.net All members of the leadership team meet twice a month as a leadership team and once a week with their individual teams. They serve as instructional leaders for their specific groups and come together as a leadership team to make and share decisions regarding systems, structures, and academics for Eastside Elementary.
Gibson, Denise	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Denise Gibson

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
37

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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	92	73	88	91	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	518
Attendance below 90 percent	22	23	18	13	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
One or more suspensions	3	5	6	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA	4	10	4	3	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Course failure in Math	7	3	3	2	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	9	7	6	5	20	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Tuesday 6/23/2020

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	102	88	95	101	115	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	34	29	26	27	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	11	12	18	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide 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	2	7	7	22	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	102	88	95	101	115	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	608
Attendance below 90 percent	34	29	26	27	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	3	2	2	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	11	12	18	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide 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	2	7	7	22	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	45%	50%	57%	39%	44%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	49%	54%	58%	42%	48%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	36%	45%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	56%	63%	41%	48%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	62%	62%	43%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	45%	51%	35%	44%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	44%	53%	38%	42%	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	43%	47%	-4%	58%	-15%
	2018	53%	44%	9%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	48%	-2%	58%	-12%
	2018	42%	47%	-5%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	37%	47%	-10%	56%	-19%
	2018	49%	45%	4%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	52%	-1%	62%	-11%
	2018	60%	48%	12%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	57%	-2%	64%	-9%
	2018	50%	54%	-4%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	70%	53%	17%	60%	10%
	2018	67%	54%	13%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	40%	41%	-1%	53%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	52%	43%	9%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison	-12%					
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	26	18		32	41						
ELL	39	51	48	62	81	63	40				
BLK	39	50	53	54	63	53	41				
HSP	46	50	42	65	78	58	43				
WHT	50	40		65	76		36				
FRL	44	48	51	63	75	57	44				
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	38	50		35	43						
ELL	41	55	56	54	62	47	38				
BLK	37	50	43	43	52	45	36				
HSP	54	55	50	65	68	55	57				
WHT	57	63		68	81		56				
FRL	49	57	50	58	66	56	50				
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	6	32	25	13	27		20				
ELL	33	40	21	35	38	13	29				
BLK	27	31	33	27	40	48	5				
HSP	42	45	32	44	44	17	48				
WHT	50	50		58	46		70				
FRL	36	38	32	38	38	36	32				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	444
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	57
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	53
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	56
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.

Our ELA data component is our lowest performing area of achievement. This has been a trend for Eastside for many years. Students arrive to Kindergarten with limit vocabulary, phonemic awareness, and phonics skills. We have been attacking those areas in planning but it is not evident in the scores yet. We will continue to work in standard based planning, data analysis, and walk- throughs to ensure that we attack this component.

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

Our ELA data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Eastside scored 45% (2018-19) which showed a decline of 5% from the 2017-18 school year which scored 50%. Our school district adopted a new ELA curriculum last year and our teachers and students were not fully acclimated to the curriculum and its materials.

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.

Our overall ELA achievement has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Eastside scored 45% (2018-19) and the average was 57%. Our school district adopted a new ELA curriculum last year and our teachers, students were not fully acclimated to the curriculum and its materials.

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

Our Math data showed the most improvement from 60% (2017-18) to 62% (2018-19). We provided students in grades 3-5 after school math tutoring (Math Club) two days a week, and had over 90% participation from grade 3rd-5th.

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

One area of concern as per the EWS data from Part 1 (D), is the growth in the number from last year of students that demonstrate early warning indicators in grades 3rd-5th.

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

1. Increase reading proficiency to 55% in the year 2020-21.
2. Continue improving high impact best practice strategies through professional development and standard based planning.
3. increase science proficiency to 50% in the year 2020-21.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Eastside will incorporate standard base planning and instruction throughout the school. If standard based planning/ instruction is implement with fidelity then reading proficiency will be increased.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase reading proficiency from 45% to 55% by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement standard based planning for reading. Teachers will plan together for an additional 2 hours a month to ensure that their plans align to the standards. Teachers will also plan for standard based aligned assignments to ensure students demonstrate lesson mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for effective instruction to take place, a teacher must use a strong planning approach that breaks down the standards. Our plan is to dive deeply into the context and asses them with authentic student work.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set monthly dates for teacher planning sessions. Administration will be involved with the session.
2. Create an agenda for planning session that include create scale, breaking standard apart, daily targets, authentic classwork that aligns to standard.
3. Admin weekly walkthrough with feedback.
4. Data meetings monthly looking at current data with students authentic work.

Person Responsible	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practices, such as, students engagement is a research based strategy to increase retention of information in a subject area. Students engagement was identified as a critical need through conversation with the leadership team after reviewing school data and informal walkthrough throughout the school.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase reading proficiency from 45% to 55% by May 2021. Increase math proficiency from 62% to 65% by May 2021. Increase science proficiency from 43% to 50% by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Denise Gibson (gibsond@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Eastside will be incorporating student engagement activities through each subject. There must be at least one per subject per day in the lesson plan. The teachers will place a star or highlight the activities, to ensure they include it in each section. Admin will conduct walkthroughs weekly and this will be a look for in the informal observation. Admin will also check lesson plans for compliance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementing student engagement is an evidence-based strategy. If students are more actively engaged in the subject matter, they will retain and process new information at a higher rate of retention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student engagement PD bi- monthly for the year 20-21.
2. Teacher plan student engagement activities for each subject area (Reading, Math, Science). Lesson plans should have the activities indicated by a star or highlighted.
3. Admin conduct walkthroughs (is an engagement activity planned/ how many students are engaged in the lesson)
4. Review trend data from walkthrough and lesson plan to analyze student engagement through the school.

Person Responsible   Denise Gibson (gibsond@hendry-schools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase science proficiency from 43% to 50% by May 2021. Eastside's science proficiency is below the state average by 10%.
Measurable Outcome:	If science standards are implemented and measured for science proficiency, then science achievement will increase to 50% by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement standard based instruction for science and incorporate a science progress monitoring system for grades 3rd-5th grade.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for effective instruction to take place, a teacher must use a strong planning approach that breaks down the standard. Our plan is to dive deeply into the context that must be assessed while giving students hands on experiments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PD once a month around science. Vocabulary, science investigation or experiments, etc.
2. Students will participate in a hand on experiment once a month in grades K-5.
3. Science vocabulary and key terms will be implemented in all grades K-5.
4. Progress monitoring in grades 3rd-5th will be implemented and data will be analyzed to measure proficiency of science standards.

Person Responsible	Sara Sanchez (sanchezs@hendry-schools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Additional schoolwide improvements will focus on the the lowest 25%. We have our support staff trained in a research- based program called SRA and have targeted the students that needs phonic instruction.

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.

Eastside has at least one family event per month that is either before or after work house to connect with parents, families, and other stakeholders. These events span from data with donuts to a winter concert that supports our school mission and needs of students.

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: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**