

Broward County Public Schools

Plantation High 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

Plantation High School

6901 NW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33313

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Parinaz Bristol

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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 Broward 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

Plantation High School

6901 NW 16TH ST, Plantation, FL 33313

[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)
High School 9-12	No	66%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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 Plantation High School is to meet the needs of all its students by providing an education balanced by academic excellence, career pathways, community service and extracurricular activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
Bristol , Parinaz	Principal	Supervise and manage all aspects of the school.
Edwards, Jonothan	Assistant Principal	Supervises the Social Studies & Fine Arts/PE Departments and is the admin over 10th grade
Gayle, Nichola	Assistant Principal	Supervises the English, IB, Cambridge Departments and is the admin over 11th grade
Rios, Sylvia	Assistant Principal	Supervises the World Language and CTE Departments and is the admin over 12th grade
Major, Horatio	Assistant Principal	Supervises the Math and Science Departments and is the admin over 9th grade

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Parinaz Bristol

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.*

2

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

82

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	504	494	447	475	1920
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	107	80	87	392
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136	153	136	96	521
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105	116	106	91	418
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167	150	149	135	601
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	150	84	87	507

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	1	2	24	0	27

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	53	51	38	53	195
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	14

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	0	0	0	507	481	491	501	1980
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	39	52	36	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
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	0	0	0	155	169	154	169	647

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	55	30	40	29	154

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	1	2	8	6	17

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	0	0	0	507	481	491	501	1980
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	39	52	36	191
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
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	0	0	0	155	169	154	169	647

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	55	30	40	29	154

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	1	2	8	6	17

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	40%	57%	56%	37%	56%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	52%	51%	41%	51%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	45%	42%	30%	43%	41%
Math Achievement	31%	51%	51%	36%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	31%	44%	48%	32%	43%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	43%	45%	23%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	56%	66%	68%	49%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	54%	71%	73%	56%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	43%	57%	-14%	55%	-12%
	2018	33%	55%	-22%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	33%	53%	-20%	53%	-20%
	2018	38%	53%	-15%	53%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	67%	-12%	67%	-12%
2018	54%	62%	-8%	65%	-11%
Compare		1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	67%	-15%	70%	-18%
2018	48%	66%	-18%	68%	-20%
Compare		4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	24%	61%	-37%	61%	-37%
2018	33%	63%	-30%	62%	-29%
Compare		-9%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	56%	-22%	57%	-23%
2018	28%	51%	-23%	56%	-28%
Compare		6%			

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	21	25	23	24	40	41	35	43		95	31
ELL	25	38	42	30	36	43	45	43		85	59
ASN	63	43		36				80		100	68
BLK	34	41	33	27	30	29	50	53		94	60
HSP	47	48	50	38	38	40	65	54		90	65
MUL	57	44		41	20		64	53			
WHT	70	59		54	30		88	63		93	68
FRL	37	42	35	29	32	30	55	50		93	61
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	26	45	39	31	44	46	33	32		74	43
ELL	15	41	49	22	47	33	30	17		78	50
ASN	52	68		46			55	76		88	52
BLK	34	45	42	28	39	44	52	44		94	42
HSP	43	50	53	33	44	45	62	63		92	58
MUL	53	58		41	22		71	30		100	69
WHT	51	43		51	55		79	84		90	60
FRL	35	46	44	29	39	43	53	47		92	45

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	15	33	30	24	28		24	26		77	31
ELL	6	27	27	18	45		19	18		80	40
ASN	71	69		56	43		80	75		90	84
BLK	31	38	30	30	28	19	43	48		93	38
HSP	43	41	27	48	46	44	58	64		91	60
MUL	51	46		44	30		69			93	31
WHT	63	55		55	42	33	73	87		93	69
FRL	34	38	30	33	31	23	47	52		91	44

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	48
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	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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	45
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	65
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
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	53
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	47
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	66
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	46
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.

Mathematics achievement showed the lowest performance. The data remained the same from the previous year. Students showed no improvement from year to year. Student learning gaps from previous years contributed to the lack of improvement from year to year. Also, under-performing students with disabilities, minimal teacher collaboration, and teacher in depth data analysis to be used to drive instruction.

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

Mathematics Low 25 learning gains showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Factors that contributed to this decline include vast learning gaps of students, under-performing students with disabilities, minimal teacher collaboration, and teacher in depth data analysis to be used to drive instruction.

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.

Mathematics achievement showed the lowest performance. The data remained the same from the previous year. Students showed no improvement from year to year. Student learning gaps from previous years contributed to the lack of improvement from year to year. Also, under-performing students with disabilities, minimal teacher collaboration, and teacher in depth data analysis to be used to drive instruction.

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

ELA and Social Studies Achievement showed the most improvement. Both ELA and Social Studies work collaboratively with each other. A literacy school-wide initiative was implemented across all content areas. Data analysis played a role in teacher making informed decisions for instruction.

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

The number of students with level 1 achievement on statewide assessments is an area of concern.

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

1. Improve achievement levels for Math
2. Improve low 25 achievement level for Math
3. Improve low 25 achievement level for ELA
4. Improve learning gains for ELA and Mathematics
5. Improve federal index for Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve ELA learning gains and ELA Low 25 learning gains. Both areas lost points between 4-9 percentage points when compared to the previous year. Students will make gains towards proficiency in their grade level
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains will increase from 43% to 47% ELA lowest 25 learning gains will increase from 35% to 40%
--------------------------------	--

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
---	---------------------

Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies being used include formative assessments based on standards taught. In addition, cornell-note taking and annotation as school-wide literacy initiatives in all content areas.
-------------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies were selected because it allows for students to learn how to close read text and further their understanding of the text.
---	--

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach support for teachers and students
Progress Monitoring via formative assessments
Monitoring the implementation of the school-wide initiative
ELA Pullout Groups
ELA support in the after-school program

Person Responsible	[no one identified]
-------------------------------	---------------------

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	Improve Math achievement and learning gains. All areas either remained the same or lost points between 9-14 percentage points when compared to the previous year. Students will make gains towards proficiency in their grade level
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Math achievement will increase from 31% to 36% Math learning gains will increase from 31% to 40% Math lowest 25 learning gains will increase from 30% to 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies being used include formative assessments based on standards taught. Implementation of a math lab and pullout groups allows for students needs to be addressed in a small group setting. In addition, Algebra 1 and Geometry teachers are working collaboratively to address the needs of the students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The math students were lacking the practical hands on experience with math and the real world application of math standards and strategies. Also, the amount of learning gaps called for a more individualized approach with students.
Action Steps to Implement	
Math Instructional Leader support for teachers and students	
Progress Monitoring via formative assessments	
Math Pullout Groups	
Math support in the after-school program	
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities was the only subgroup which did not score at least a 41% on the ESSA Federal Index.

Measurable Outcome: Students with disabilities ESSA Federal will increase from 38% to 42%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities will receive additional support in their Learning Strategies class. ESE support facilitators will work collaboratively with mainly ELA and Math teachers during PLCs and implement learned strategies in their classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with disabilities have varying reason why they need additional support according to their IEPs and the best way to address those needs are to incorporate prescribed accommodations in and out of the general classroom setting.

Action Steps to Implement

Literacy Coach support for teachers and students
Math Instructional Leader support for teachers and students
Progress Monitoring via formative assessments
ELA & Math Pullout Groups
ELA & Math support in the after-school program

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will work collaboratively with staff to create a plan of action to address the priorities. Coaches, Instructional Leaders, Support Facilitators will provide additional support to students and teachers. ESE support facilitators will work collaboratively with all content area teachers in PLCs to create an implementation plan for students while in Learning strategies class. The school-wide literacy initiative will be common practice in all classrooms. Administration will monitor the progress of all students through data review, student evidence, and instructional conversations with teachers.

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.

The school administration works collaboratively with all stakeholders in order to make informed decisions relating to school improvement. Our School Advisory Council plays an active role in the decision making relating to school improvement and they support the needs of our students and staff. We operate under a mantra of family in which each stakeholder knows they are valued and respected and that is communicated on an ongoing basis.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00