Marion County Public Schools

Ocali Charter Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ocali Charter Middle School

3233 SE MARICAMP RD STE 106, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Elias Posth
Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	98%
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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: F (28%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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

N/A

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

Ocali Charter Middle School

3233 SE MARICAMP RD STE 106, Ocala, FL 34471

[no web address on file]

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)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	54%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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 mission is to help middle school students reach their greatest potential for academic, emotional, and personal success by combining individual learning styles, gifts, and talents with comprehensive curriculum and high-achieving standards in a micro-school setting.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to create high-achieving schools that inspire and motivate students to become life-long learners, responsible citizens, and positive role models in their communities. By minimizing classroom size, our micro-school concept provides opportunities for more individualized learning, safer school environments, and diverse thought and participation.

We believe education is not limited to the classroom, and envision partnerships with community leaders, business owners, parents, and other individuals in creating opportunities for exploration, community participation, and experiential learning.

Our vision includes creating a positive, inviting, and inspiring workplace for instructors and those working in education by creating opportunities for professional development, personalized teaching techniques, and competitive compensation. Motivated teachers motivate students.

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
Matthews, Theresa	Other	Overall management and implementation of all aspects of the school.
Sheib, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	
Posth, Elias	Principal	
Shows, Kelly	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 8/3/2017, Elias Posth

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)	Middle School 6-8
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)	98%
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: C (46%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: F (28%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	54	46	60	0	0	0	0	160
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	12	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	11	0	0	0	0	32
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5	12	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	12	15	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	24	31	0	0	0	0	82

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
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 8/7/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	61	37	0	0	0	0	141
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	18	10	0	0	0	0	47

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	33	32	27	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	61	37	0	0	0	0	141
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	18	10	0	0	0	0	47

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	33	32	27	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	49%	49%	54%	29%	45%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	54%	54%	32%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	46%	47%	22%	36%	44%
Math Achievement	43%	54%	58%	22%	47%	56%
Math Learning Gains	49%	58%	57%	30%	54%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	50%	51%	41%	45%	50%
Science Achievement	47%	46%	51%	27%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	70%	72%	26%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	33%	45%	-12%	54%	-21%
	2018	54%	44%	10%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	46%	13%	52%	7%
	2018	37%	43%	-6%	51%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
08	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	26%	46%	-20%	55%	-29%
	2018	28%	42%	-14%	52%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	49%	49%	0%	54%	-5%
	2018	47%	49%	-2%	54%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		21%				
08	2019	50%	41%	9%	46%	4%
	2018	50%	43%	7%	45%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	44%	2%	48%	-2%
	2018	26%	46%	-20%	50%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	74%	65%	9%	71%	3%
2018	60%	64%	-4%	71%	-11%
Compare		14%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	20	33		13	33	36					
ELL		27		8	17	20					

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
BLK	20	47		15	37						
HSP	40	47	41	35	46	42		61			
WHT	63	56		55	57		68	88	7		
FRL	43	52	53	38	44	39	44	71	8		

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	13	57	60	27	57						
ELL	8	33		8	55						
BLK	27	53		20	40						
HSP	40	50	64	26	45	54		33			
WHT	61	58	57	53	51	64	32	73			
FRL	42	51	63	35	46	54	20	48			

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		23		14	25						
BLK	14	8		7	31						
HSP	20	30		10	5						
WHT	35	36	36	30	39		33	26			
FRL	30	33	25	17	28	40	19	24			

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27

Students With Disabilities	
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	14
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
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	56
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	44
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.

Math Achievement at an overall 49% proficient was the data component that showed the lowest performance. 6th grade 26%, 7th grade 49% and 8th grade 50%. The 2019 6th grade population was a major contributing factor to the low performance in the achievement area with 74% of the 6th grade students not proficient. This population has become a trend, thereby making a urgent need of our school to dig into the data and start MTSS immediately.

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

Math Lowest 25 percentile was the data component to show the greatest decline from the prior year at 12 points. From 55% to a 43%. The contributing factor continues to be the 6th grade population in Mathematics.

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.

6th grade math had the greatest gap with the state average at a 29% difference. 32 students were not proficient.

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

Science was the component that showed the most improvement. By increasing for 27% to 47%. This is a direct result of analyzing and dissecting the science grade level materials based on standards.

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

1. Over 65% of the OCMS student exhibit two or more Early Warning Indicators.

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

1. Increase the number of student proficient in Math.
2. Increase the overall growth of lowest 25 percentile in Math.
3. Prioritize 6th grade interventions by cloning our 7th grade efforts.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The data indicates that the area of greatest need at Ocali Charter Middle School is 7th Grade Math.
Measurable Outcome:	If 7th Grade Level 1 and 2 math students are scheduled for an intensive math course with a focus on fundamental math skills then 35% of those stude1 sub level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elias Posth (elias.posth2@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Adding intensive math to level 1 and 2 student schedules allow time for the teacher to teach the non proficient student from their level to build a strong Mathematical foundation. This allows such students to pass their regular math class and rise to the level of proficient score for the FSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to the impact of Covid-19, we based our rationale on entrance FSA scores of incoming 6th graders from 2018 and 2019. This population is in need of foundational skills.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monitor effectiveness by reviewing I-ready data each quarter facilitated by Content Area Specialist (CAS)

Person Responsible	Elias Posth (elias.posth2@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. The intensive math teacher will work and plan in partnership with the general math teacher to monitor student progress and direct instruction.

Person Responsible	Elias Posth (elias.posth2@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Parent and family math night to support learning math at home.

Person Responsible	Elias Posth (elias.posth2@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, three areas of ESSA subgroups fell below the federal index of 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	If a deliberate, sustainable, and applicable professional development program, with areas of focus on students who are below the ESSA federal index of 41%, is implemented throughout the school year then student growth in FSA ELA will increase from 49% to 52% and MATH will increase from 43% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Theresa Matthews (theresa.matthews@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will begin with a data dig of I Ready scores, from that analysis areas of need will be determined for both students and teachers driving the PD.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development will begin with a data dig of I Ready scores, from that analysis areas of need will be determined for both students and teachers driving the PD.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teams review of I-Ready Data facilitated by Content Area Specialist

Person Responsible	Elias Posth (elias.posth2@marion.k12.fl.us)

2. Needs Assessment of Teachers

Person Responsible	Theresa Matthews (theresa.matthews@marion.k12.fl.us)

3. Pairing of Teacher/Learners with similar needs

Person Responsible	Theresa Matthews (theresa.matthews@marion.k12.fl.us)

4. Use of True North Logic (TNL) and book studies

Person Responsible	Theresa Matthews (theresa.matthews@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

After data analysis, provide professional development and monitor PD activities in an effort provide strategies and best practices to engage students in the rigor of the standard to increase math achievement.

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.

All students are very important to Ocali Charter Middle School. Their well-being emotionally and socially, especially at the middle school level is vital to their success. Our goal is to enable our students to become productive, contributing members of our school, society, and their community with an appreciation and acceptance of diversity. Administration works as a team with the school faculty, staff, parents and the community to create a climate and culture of caring and positiveness. Ocali Charter Middle School provides education, prevention, early identification and intervention that helps the students achieve academic, emotional, and behavioral success. Administration meets with students and parents each year in the interview process to assess a student's social and emotional needs. Students are mentored and progress monitored for progression and success. Courtesy calls are administered to parents to ensure successful forward motion from challenges. If additional programs are needed, the student will be referred to other services to meet their needs.

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: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00