Osteen Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Osteen Elementary School

500 DOYLE RD, Osteen, FL 32764

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/osteen/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Scott Lifvendahl

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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 Volusia 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

Osteen Elementary School

500 DOYLE RD, Osteen, FL 32764

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/osteen/pages/default.aspx

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 KG-5	Yes	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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 Osteen Elementary family of parents, teachers, and the community members are dedicated to the total development of each child in a positive learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Everyone, everyday striving to excel in every way!

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
Bambrick, James	Principal	Instructional Leader that supports the collaboration of PLC's and provides opportunities for professional learning.
Figueroa, Laura	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader that provides the professional learning calendar and agendas. Facilitates and coordinates SLT meetings and Professional Learning opportunities for all faculty and staff.
Goodling, Roxanne	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Instructional Leader. Liaison between the School Leadership Team and the KG PLC Team.
Tramont, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Instructional Leader that liaison's information and teacher point of view between the School Leadership Team and her PLC.
Vazquez, Evette	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Instructional Leader. She coordinates information between the 2nd grade PLC and the School Leadership Team. She is also the SAC Chair coordinating SAC meetings and providing parents with opportunities to share thoughts and opinions on school decisions.
Brown, Robin	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade Instructional Leader providing the point of view of her 4th grade team while incorporating the school goals and communicating School Leadership decisions.
Davis, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Instructional Leader that serves as a liaison for PLC and School Leadership Team.
Gold, Pauline	Teacher, ESE	ESE leader to ensure our data discussions include our students with disabilities and decisions always include inclusive practices.
West, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Intervention teacher and DLTL to assist with data driven discussions about learning gains and ways to include technology for student engagement across campus activities.
Randall, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Academic Coach with the focus on standards driven instruction and ensuring teachers are receiving the support needed to improve lessons and provide standards based instruction and assessments.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/19/2020, Scott Lifvendahl

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
40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (55%)
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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/19/2020

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	67	79	89	78	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	14	15	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	0	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	67	79	89	78	80	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	12	7	14	15	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	0	0	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	65%	56%	57%	59%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	47%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	53%	36%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	59%	63%	62%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	56%	62%	54%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	43%	51%	45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	57%	53%	67%	59%	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	75%	58%	17%	58%	17%
	2018	64%	56%	8%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	54%	-1%	58%	-5%
	2018	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	63%	54%	9%	56%	7%
	2018	42%	51%	-9%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	60%	16%	62%	14%
	2018	61%	58%	3%	62%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	59%	-9%	64%	-14%
	2018	52%	60%	-8%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	47%	54%	-7%	60%	-13%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
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	38	36	32	35	28	33	57				
ELL	50	58		41	50		54				
BLK	60	41		48	39						
HSP	61	62	41	56	55	46	77				
WHT	70	61	43	63	51	35	81				
FRL	61	56	42	56	47	32	69				

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	33	50	47	32	51	59	56				
ELL	45	50	42	47	55		40				
BLK	44	29		38	47		31				
HSP	49	42	38	51	46	44	35				
WHT	62	59	50	62	54	48	76				
FRL	52	49	39	54	51	51	60				

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	32	22	17	41	47	53	47				
ELL	38	30	30	48	50						
BLK	44	50		44	57		50				
HSP	51	33	29	52	34	29	52				
WHT	64	52	40	69	59	50	80				
FRL	53	48	42	58	54	55	63				

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	55
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	438
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	51
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	47
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	56
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	58
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	52
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 Lowest Quartile demonstrated the lowest performance overall. The School Leadership Team discussed the need to build up common core math lessons. We saw a deficiency in student ability with math facts fluency. Teachers were not using common assessments to ensure common lessons in Math. There was a large ESE seperate class that did not have a teacher for all of the 2018 - 2019 school year.

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

Math Lowest Quartile had a drop of 15 points from the prior year. Specifically, 5th grade proficiency in Math. Teachers agreed math vocabulary was a big factor and helping students understand what exactly was the Math question asking students because the questions were very lengthy.

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 was for the Math proficiency level 5. Osteen had 5% of students and the state had 12%.The gap in math proficiency was a result of lack of standards based teaching and in depth curriculum coverage.

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

We also saw a postive gap in Science proficieny where Osteen had 24 points higher than the state in profeiciency. We believe the science gap is due to a designated intervention teacher for 5th grade that worked on 3rd and 4th grade standards as well as curriculum.

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

Attendance is an area of concern, however our Parent Liaison created a reward system that was improving some of our specific students attendance.

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

1. Safety
2. Curriculum
3. Engagement
4. Social Emotional Needs
5. Community Involvement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the drop in Math proficeincy for our lowest quartile students we are focusing on improving our leanring gains for our lowest quartile students. We have designated one intervention teacher for 3rd, 4th and 5th to work on only Math standards with Tier 2 students.
Measurable Outcome:	We will use I Ready math diagnostic and online instruction to measure student growth. We expect each student to demonstrate their full typical growth towards thier Math on grade level score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Patricia Randall (prandall@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math specific designated intervention teacher for Intermediate grades. Primary intervention teacher. Standards aligned instruction Common assessments per grade level using Envision math curriculum
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers are creating common standards based instruction in math and the intervention teacher is supporting these lessons by focusing on vocabulary and power standards then we should see improvement in Math data through I Ready.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify lowest quartile students.
2. Create a master schedule that will allow for intervention, ESE, ESOL as well as quality blocks of time for curriculum.
3. Share FSA and ESSA data with faculty to refresh the learning on school report cards and learning gains.

Person Responsible	Laura Figueroa (lfiguero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Intervention teachers will work with small groups and use progress monitoring to adjust lessons.
4. Academic coach will work with primary teachers to ensure intervention of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in Math.
5. Have PLC meetings to follow up on student progress.

Person Responsible	Patricia Randall (prandall@volusia.k12.fl.us)

6. Have data chats with teachers and administration to help teachers focus on standards and share how they are using data to mold instruction to student needs.

Person Responsible	James Bambrick (jbambri@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Progress monitoring of ESE students due to this being the only subgroup below 41% in our ESSA report card. Improve our students with disability proficiency to 45%.
Measurable Outcome:	I Ready growth in ELA and Math to demonstrate a years worth of growth in their typical growth scale score.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Pauline Gold (pgold@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group Instruction Modeling and Reciprocal teaching Using I ready online instruction to close achievement gaps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ESE teachers and paras will use small group instruction with modeling and reciprical teaching to ensure student growth in ELA and Math standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students with disabilities that are also on the lowest quartile list.
2. Create a master schedule that ensures quality ELA and Math blocks of time for these students to get their services.

Person Responsible   Laura Figueroa (lfiguero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use Small group instruction with Reciprical Teaching and Modeling repetition.

Person Responsible   Pauline Gold (pgold@volusia.k12.fl.us)

3. Use progress monitoring of common assessments to identify students that need additional supports..
4. Have PLC meeting between the seperate class ESE teacher and grade level teachers to discuss expected standards and proficiency.
5. Have school wide vertical teams to improve the communication of grade level expectations for all students.

Person Responsible   Laura Figueroa (lfiguero@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Provide a safe learning environment for all students while ensuring curriculum is the focus. Minimize Tier 2 / Tier 3 students from 1st to 2nd and 2nd to 3rd. This will demostrate growth. Ensure ESE students recieve all services with fidelity.

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.

Kids Kam Morning news show is on You Tube safe share for parents to see at home.
Class Dojo for school wide communication
Using the School Messanger texting feature
Placing the school newsletter on the website.

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: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00