

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Beacon College PREP K 8



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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Beacon College PREP K 8

13400 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Sergio Bonilla

Start Date for this Principal: 10/12/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	75%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	CS&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 Dade 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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Beacon College PREP K 8

13400 NW 28TH AVE, Opa Locka, FL 33054

[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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	99%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Dade 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.

Beacon College Prep leads middle school students to superior academic achievement, cultivates their talents and interests and fosters admirable character traits to establish strong foundations that prepare students for success in high school, college and beyond.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is the path to our mission. It is both what we seek to realize 20 years down the road, as well as our methodical path towards that aim. It is ambitious, yet realistic. It lives only if those who execute it daily believe in it.

Beacon College Prep will change the world through the eventual accomplishments of our students. We exist to serve low-income students of color, however, we do not believe – as many institutions do – that success is defined by “getting out” of their current neighborhood circumstance. It is actually quite opposite. We teach our students about systemic injustice, work-ethic, empathy, the history of Miami and opportunities all in hopes that they will embrace their community and deeply aspire to come back and improve it. We want our students to be prepared for success to and through college in hopes that they commit to improving the community which raised them instead of “escaping” to line their pockets in prestigious legal or corporate jobs. Our theory of change involves students as well as our institution because we know that change – enduring change - comes from within. No external entity can fundamentally change Opa Locka, Liberty City or any other predominantly black community for the better: only residents from and that can do that. Beacon College Prep seeks to position itself to facilitate that change because we believe so deeply in the potential of our students and the promise of our community.

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
Evans, Patrick	Principal	As the school's principal, Mr. Evans provides a mission and shapes a vision for academic success for all students. Data is utilized to drive decision-making, cultivate leadership in others, and provide the appropriate curriculum offerings.
Derby, Khnita	Assistant Principal	Ms. Derby works in collaboration with the principal in implementing the vision and mission for the school. She ensures fidelity by evaluating the following: instructional staff's implementation of tiered instruction, process of administering assessments, and the alignment of professional development with faculty needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/12/2020, Sergio Bonilla

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

17

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-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)	75%
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 Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
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	CS&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	81	81	52	0	0	0	0	214	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	10	0	0	0	0	24	
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	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	22	0	0	0	0	81	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	22	0	0	0	0	81	

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	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	12

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	
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

Monday 10/12/2020

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	81	81	52	0	0	0	0	214	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	10	0	0	0	0	24	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	24	22	0	0	0	0	81	

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	4	3	5	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	81	52	0	0	0	0	214	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	17	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	0	0	0	38	45	51	0	0	0	0	134	

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	34	40	0	0	0	0	107	

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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	
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	31%	63%	61%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	61%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	57%	54%	0%	55%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	37%	67%	62%	0%	62%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	63%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	56%	52%	0%	52%	50%
Science Achievement	15%	56%	56%	0%	53%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	80%	78%	0%	75%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	42%	58%	-16%	54%	-12%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		42%				
07	2019	22%	56%	-34%	52%	-30%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	26%	60%	-34%	56%	-30%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		26%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	40%	58%	-18%	55%	-15%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		40%				
07	2019	18%	53%	-35%	54%	-36%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		18%				
08	2019	33%	40%	-7%	46%	-13%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		33%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	15%	43%	-28%	48%	-33%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		15%				

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	57%	73%	-16%	71%	-14%
2018					
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%	63%	-63%	61%	-61%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	57%	-57%
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	27	27		25	58						
ELL	50	82		53	44		20				
BLK	31	39	32	36	44	59	16	59	46		
HSP	39	71		47	39						
FRL	31	42	37	37	44	53	15	58	46		
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	27	27		25	58						
ELL	50	82		53	44		20				
BLK	31	39	32	36	44	59	16	59	46		
HSP	39	71		47	39						
FRL	31	42	37	37	44	53	15	58	46		
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	27	27		25	58						
ELL	50	82		53	44		20				
BLK	31	39	32	36	44	59	16	59	46		
HSP	39	71		47	39						
FRL	31	42	37	37	44	53	15	58	46		

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
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	362
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	50
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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Science Achievement was the lowest performance component, by far. We were only able to lead 15% of our 8th grade students to proficiency. This compares to 52% for the district.

The science FCAT is a culmination of what students learn in their middle school experience, not simply what they learn in any one given year (8th grade). That said, our 8th graders did not attend middle schools that prioritized science instruction in earlier grades. Our 8th grade science teacher faced significant gaps in knowledge, and essentially scrambled to teach 3 years of science in one. Additionally, our science teacher struggled with classroom management, and therefore struggled to lead her 8th grade students to proficiency. We are working diligently this year to support her in internalizing her curricular resources and managing her class to results.

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

N/A - this was the first year of BCP middle school.

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.

FCAT Science had the largest gap between the state average. We believe that this gap is due to a misaligned curriculum, and a lack of remediation provided to students via tutoring. Students in 8th grade had significant gaps in knowledge and skills as they pertained to science. This year we'll be utilizing our resources to provide more tutoring opportunities to remedy those gaps.

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

N/A - this was the first year of BCP middle school.

However, our civics teacher led 58% of her students to proficiency, despite only 22% of 7th graders being proficient in ELA, and 18% being proficient in mathematics. Our civics teacher was incredibly committed, capable and coachable, and she did not let student gaps in knowledge or skills stop them from being successful on this assessment. While 58% still paces behind the State average, we are confident that next year, as she works with a more advanced cohort of 7th graders, that she will outpace the State average. Strong teaching leads to strong results from students, and our Civics teacher is a testament to that fact.

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

The biggest areas for concern are the volume of students scoring level 1, and the volume of students who failed to make learning gains. Our students are behind academically, but that is no excuse for them to stay behind. This year, we'll focus on leading them to growth, because incremental progress - year after year - will catch them up to where they need to be.

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

1. Improving science achievement for 8th grade students
2. Improving ELA growth for all students
3. Improving mathematics growth for all students
4. Maximizing potential on EOC assessments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The 4 areas of focus that we identified relate directly to improving our accountability measures because we significantly underperformed in 2018/19. Granted, 2018/19 was our founding year, and inherent in any founding year are challenges (Delay in CSP purchases and MSID for hiring and scheduling, 140 of 180 total students being new to BCP, doubling size of staff over the summer, etc), we will not allow these challenges to deter us from confidently pursuing our mission because we know that our students deserve that courage from their educators. We are eager to enact the action plan for improvement stated above because they are all measurable and attainable goals.

These areas of focus will not replace our other areas of significant focus: leading from a vision towards the attainment of a mission. We will still be a school that focuses on cultivating a loving and safe student culture, and aims to holistically develop students. We will still be a school that is responsive to the needs of our community, and innovative in addressing the varied needs of our students. We'll still be a school that takes pride in the quality of the experience we're providing for all stakeholders because these things are important, and will be what ends up mattering in the long-run. This year, however, our 4 areas for focus are an explicit acknowledgement that there can be no long-term without short-term, incremental academic progress. It is, therefore, imperative that we shift our focus and resources towards ensuring that a year like 2018/19 never happens again, and that starts in August 2019.

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.

Beacon College Prep executes a variety of strategies that help build positive relationships with families to increase involvement:

Monthly parent meetings - We conduct monthly parent meetings to share information (student data, new procedures, etc), hear parent concerns, and facilitate sessions that build parent skill in translating the things we do at school to the home life. These sessions focus primarily on helping parents structure practice for literacy and mathematics, as well as how to implement an incentive system at home for behavior.

Events for families - We also try to hold events for parents to get together in a less formal setting so they can network and form a more personal bond with staff. These events range from a fall festival to social outings.

Volunteer opportunities for parents - We offer many volunteer opportunities for our parents, including bus aide, breakfast helper, lunch helper, snack helper, classroom management support, and office support. Parents are eager to assist us in the realization of our mission. By structuring opportunities for them to assist, we gain a tangible benefit of their work products, as well as the intangible benefit of them being role models in the school for all of our students.

Weekly communication logs with parents - We have developed a weekly communication log that is sent home each Friday where teachers communicate student behavior, academic performance, homework completion and uniform compliance. We have received positive feedback from parents about the log, as it helps them stay informed about what occurs while their child is in school.

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.

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------