St. Lucie Public Schools

Morningside 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 10

Planning for Improvement 15

Positive Culture & Environment 18

Budget to Support Goals 19

Morningside Elementary School

2300 SE GOWIN DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/mse/

Demographics

Principal: Valerie Forman

Start Date for this Principal: 8/14/2020

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)	66%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 St. Lucie 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 19

Morningside Elementary School

2300 SE GOWIN DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34952

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/mse/

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	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	49%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the St. Lucie 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.

The mission of Morningside Elementary School is to provide all students a safe and positive learning environment, rigorous academic curriculum, and access to technological resources evidenced by continuous student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Morningside Elementary School, in partnership with families and the community, will be an educational institution of academic excellence. Each student will be afforded the opportunity to reach his or her maximum potential to be a successful citizen in the global society.

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
Melrose, Kathleen	Principal	
Murray, Juliete	School Counselor	
Monroe, Lauren	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/14/2020, Valerie Forman

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	66%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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	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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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

Friday 8/14/2020

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	105	104	105	102	97	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	5	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	3	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	0	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	

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	105	104	105	102	97	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	2	8	5	8	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	3	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	4	0	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	

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	68%	50%	57%	63%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	56%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	53%	36%	56%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	53%	63%	74%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	50%	62%	52%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	42%	51%	24%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	46%	53%	65%	44%	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	69%	50%	19%	58%	11%
	2018	68%	46%	22%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	75%	51%	24%	58%	17%
	2018	58%	50%	8%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	55%	48%	7%	56%	-1%
	2018	70%	49%	21%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	81%	55%	26%	62%	19%
	2018	81%	54%	27%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	54%	28%	64%	18%
	2018	72%	57%	15%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	53%	47%	6%	60%	-7%
	2018	72%	55%	17%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	48%	46%	2%	53%	-5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	50%	19%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
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	24	41	36	30	43	41	21				
ELL	37			68							
BLK	55	70	43	67	57		35				
HSP	65	65	44	73	70	53	46				
MUL	61			56							
WHT	74	60	35	78	60	47	62				
FRL	60	59	43	66	58	46	36				

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	22	47	50	34	55	57	42				
BLK	44	46	36	64	50	33	36				
HSP	61	56	42	69	60	50	70				
MUL	69	60		69	60						
WHT	75	67	73	83	69	67	80				
FRL	56	57	47	68	56	50	63				

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	24	41	33	38	36	31					
ASN	70										
BLK	44	59	30	65	45	20	52				
HSP	64	52	40	69	50	25	70				
MUL	40	30		53	50						
WHT	72	59	36	80	55	29	72				
FRL	58	57	42	71	49	24	61				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
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	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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
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	59
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.

Overall 5th Grade showed the lowest performance in all areas of achievement. ELA (42%), Math (49%), & Science (49%). An additional area of low performance was school bottom quartile in both ELA (42%) & Math (49%). Bottom Quartile data was also the lowest performance for the 2018-2019 school year. Struggles in effective collaborative planning as well as implementation of standards based instruction and reteach was a contributing factor to this low performance.

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

The greatest decline was in 5th grade ELA (from 70% proficient to 55% proficient),Math (from72% proficient to 53% proficient), and Science (from 69% proficient to 49% proficient). Struggles in effective collaborative planning as well as implementation of standards based instruction and reteach

was a contributing factor to this low performance. In addition, the change in Science Curriculum posed a barrier for the team.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was in the area of Science Achievement: MSE 49% as compared to the state 53% (-7%). Some of the factors contributing to this gap included new team members unfamiliar with the depth of the standards in addition the change in science curriculum posed a barrier. Finally, there was a discrepancy between district unit test and FSA results. The district unit tests gave a false number of students predicted to be proficient.

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

The following data components showed the most improvement: 4th grade ELA Achievement from 58% to 75% proficient + 17, as well as Black Students in the area of ELA Achievement 44% to 55% (+11) and ELA Learning Gains from 46% to 70 % (+24).

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

The following data components showed the most improvement: 4th grade ELA Achievement from 58% to 75% proficient + 17, as well as Black Students in the area of ELA Achievement 44% to 55% (+11) and ELA Learning Gains from 46% to 70 % (+24).

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

1. Bottom Quartile Learning Gains ELA
2. Bottom Quartile Learning Gains MATH
3. Science Achievement
4. 5th Grade ELA Achievement
5. 5th Grade Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of student achievement subgroup data indicates students with disabilities are not achieving at the same rate as their non-disabled peers in reading and math.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase our SWD ELA , currently at 26%, and Math Achievement currently at 32%, to above 50% proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE teachers will work collaboratively with general education teachers to close the achievement gap of SWD. Standards based differentiated instruction will be provided to students with disabilities in order to close the gap between them and their peers. A school-wide approach for planning and implementing Universal Design for learning across all instructional and non-instructional school contextx will be adopted.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SWD will be provided additional remediation as well as additional small group instruction in the general education classroom. iReady resources on and below level will be used in small group and remediation. Additional intervention resources will be used to meet IEP goals. Flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for students individual needs will be the school's focus.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be trained in UDL planning through FDLRS
2. Identify areas of need for each students.
3. Collaborative planning between ESE support and general education teachers.
4. Implement remediation and additional small group support.
5. Track student progress.
5. Reteach as needed.

Person Responsible	Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of teacher survey results, & Panorama Student & Staff Survey Data, indicate a need to address the social emaotional learning needs of our school.
Measurable Outcome:	Student perception of being able to self regulate their own behavior will increase by 25% as measured by the Panorama survey data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Explicit instruction of SEL utilizing Sanford Harmony will be implemented to teach students the 5 SEL competencies. Daily circles will be facilitated to allow students opportunities for practice of self-regulation skills. The SEL school based committee will montior and promote SEL activities.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Intentional focus on Self Regulation skills will reduce discipline concerns as well as enhance a positive learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. SEL Training for all staff
2. Implemetation of Daily Circles
3.Monthly discipline Data Review with SEL Committee
4. Additional and ongoing support from SEL district department as needed.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Other specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science Achievement Data had the biggest gap as compared to the state as well as the greatest decrease in year to year comparison.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase our student achievement data currently at 49% to 70% or above.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauren Monroe (lauren.monroe@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students in 5th grade will participate in hands on science based activities as well as reading in the content areas to increase overall proficiency in Science.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Hands on experiences as well as greater exposure to science content through reading will enhance student performance. Resources such as Science Studies weekly and Common Lit will be utilized in the core curriculum. Additionally, 5th grade students will receive additional science instruction during Media resource. Finally, students will be provided hands on experiences in the Science Lab.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify and obtain a deeper understanding of the standards being tested.
2. Establish interactive notebooks.
3. Assess and reteach based on formative and summative assessments.
4. Track students progress.
5. Reteach as needed.

Person Responsible	Kathleen Melrose (kathleen.melrose@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Remaining schoolwide improvement priorities will be addressed through regularly scheduled data meetings and crunch time planning.

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.

Morningside Elementary School will continue to involve parents in the decision making processes and planning via its School Advisory Council meetings, feedback received from parents on an on-going basis during conferences and other collaborative parent school opportunities. The process will begin with Open House prior to the opening of school by making parents feel welcome and inviting them to become partners in their child's education. The process of making parents and families feel welcome and motivating them to become involved will be ongoing. MSE will offer meetings at various times to support our parents and families.

The school will provide information regarding parent meetings using: Monthly Parent Newsletters, the school website, Skyward Portal, School Messenger in English and Spanish (when translator is available), and Friday Communication Folders. Information concerning assessments, curriculum information and the way in which it is assessed and data will be discussed throughout the year. These times may include Open house, student led conferences, School Advisory Council meetings, Parent Conferences, IEP meetings, EP meetings, and MTSS meetings. Progress monitoring, data, including, but not limited to FSA, and district assessments will be shared with parents during SAC meetings and parent conferences. Parents will be notified of SAC and PTO meetings in the parent newsletters, marquee, and School Messenger phone calls. The parent newsletter is sent home with students the first part of each month. Activities for that month will be on a calendar within the newsletter. Follow-up School Messenger messages will be made prior to the event. Parental feedback and sign-in sheets will be used to monitor attendance.

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: Other: Students with Disabilities**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Science**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**