

Manatee County Public Schools

Freedom Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

<https://www.manateeschools.net/freedom>

Demographics

Principal: Guy Grimes

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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	18

Freedom Elementary School

9515 E STATE ROAD 64, Bradenton, FL 34212

<https://www.manateeschools.net/freedom>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	40%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

We, the family of Freedom Elementary, in order to form a more dynamic school, establish a community of innovative learners, empower all students to reach their individual potential, provide a safe and secure environment, promote cultural diversity in an ever-changing world, and inspire a spirit of life-long learning for our school community, establish this mission for Freedom Elementary School.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Freedom Elementary is to enhance our instructional delivery, with the purpose of increasing our students' academic achievement.

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
Grimes, Guy	Principal	oversees the running of all aspects of the school
Danowski, Michele	Assistant Principal	
Brunner, Sherri	School Counselor	
Cleveland, Kenzie	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/31/2020, Guy Grimes

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

0

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	44%
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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	79	62	85	83	87	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	2	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	5	0	0	0	0	0	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 8/31/2020

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	76	107	93	117	108	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	10	8	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	12	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	7	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	76	107	93	117	108	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	636
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	10	8	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	12	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	7	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	61%	52%	57%	57%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	64%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	53%	45%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	57%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	68%	62%	50%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	53%	51%	31%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	48%	53%	49%	42%	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	52%	51%	1%	58%	-6%
	2018	55%	49%	6%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	56%	8%	58%	6%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	64%	52%	12%	56%	8%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	62%	-17%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	65%	1%	64%	2%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	67%	60%	7%	60%	7%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	48%	13%	53%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	49%	9%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	18	38	37	21	51	47	20				
ELL	27	43	32	23	58	52	23				
ASN	100			100							
BLK	43	46	38	36	46	30	40				
HSP	41	56	44	39	61	45	46				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	76	74	69	75	72		81				
FRL	42	58	44	43	60	43	44				
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	10	32	37	14	37	29	18				
ELL	35	53	45	33	43	29	9				
ASN	85			92							
BLK	35	39	33	35	50	33					
HSP	39	47	44	42	51	35	41				
MUL	67			60							
WHT	71	58	47	78	69	54	70				
FRL	40	43	42	44	53	35	40				
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	7	45	50	19	21	26	13				
ELL	27	43	47	31	37	15	6				
BLK	32	48	33	34	42	42	31				
HSP	35	49	47	35	40	23	21				
MUL	87	79		79	71						
WHT	70	72	50	71	55	38	64				
FRL	39	53	43	39	38	31	34				

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	59
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	100
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	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	
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	55
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	75
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	50
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.

Freedom's data component that indicated the lowest performance was in the area of Math Lowest 25 percentile. The contributing factors to the low performance were the change in curriculum resources, new staff and influx of students throughout the year.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was overall Math Achievement. The contributing factor was the decline in 3rd grade's overall Math performance.

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 data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average was the Math Lowest 25th percentile. The contributing factors to the low performance were the change in curriculum resources, new staff and influx of students throughout the year. This indicates the need for additional standards training for teachers. Trends to note, that even though 3rd grade declined and 5th grade increased, this has been the pattern over the last three years with the exception of 3rd grade's decline.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was ELA learning gains. The new actions taken to enhance our ELA scores was the use of accountability partners, intensive support team collaboration, the decision tree and, improvements in the tiered system.

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

When reflecting on the EWS data from Part 1, the potential area of concern is attendance.

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

1. The proficiency for Math Achievement will increase from 59% to 65% on the FSA by the end of the 2020 - 2021 school year. We have determined that we need 179 students in grades 3-5 out of 275 to score proficient in order to achieve our goal of 65%.
2. The proficiency for ELA Lowest 25th percentile will increase from 48% to 55% on the FSA by the end of the 2020-2021 school year, while 3rd grade overall ELA Achievement will increase from 55% to 65%. We have determined that we need 54 students in grade 3 out of 83 to score proficient in order to achieve our goal or 65%.
3. In addition to the above areas of focus, our school will continue to develop the area of increasing student attendance. In the area of student attendance, we will monitor attendance and identify anyone who falls below the 90 percentile. Those students identified will receive a letter and or phone call to inquire if any assistance is needed and a home visit by the school Social Worker will be conducted if there is no improvement.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	1.Math Lowest 25th Percentile 2. Overall Math Achievement
Description and Rationale:	The two areas of focus in math were identified because of the drop in proficiency which includes the need to support our SWD, ELL and African American students. This focus addresses the students overall understanding of the mathematical standards in their current grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	The proficiency of Math achievement will increase from 59% to 65% on the FSA by the end of the 2020-2021 school year. We have determined that we need 179 out of 275 students to score proficient in order to achieve our goal of 65%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Freedom will be continuing implementation of Acaletics for grades 3-5 in order to increase student proficiency. Other resources include EnVision Math series, Standards Based Mastery Assessments and IReady.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy was proven success with various schools in our district. The school data we researched showed a double digit increase in student proficiency.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acquire material 2. Provide Professional Development for the teachers 3. Implement the product 4. Monitor Student Progress 5. Adjust when needed 	
Person Responsible	Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	1. ELA Lowest 25th percentile 2. ELA 3rd grade overall achievement
Description and Rationale:	The two areas of focus in ELA were identified because of the drop in proficiency which includes support for our SWD, ELL and African American students. This focus addresses the students overall understanding of the ELA standards in their current grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	The proficiency for the ELA Lowest 25th percentile will increase from the 48% to the 55% on the FSA by the end of the 2020-2021 school year, while 3rd grade overall ELA Achievement will increase from 55% to 65%. We have determined that we need 54 students in grade 3 out of 83 to score proficient in order to achieve our goal of 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Guy Grimes (grimesg@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Freedom will be implementing standards based planning for 3rd grade, professional development around conferring with students and differentiating instruction for subgroups, along with restructuring for tier 2 and tier 3 services in order to increase student proficiency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategy was drawn from a survey on teacher's needs to support instructional delivery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development from the book Reading Conferences by Jenifer Serravallo
2. Provide weekly support from our Curriculum Specialist in the area of standards based planning
3. Monitor through evaluations, data chats and lesson plans
4. Aligned instructional resources to support tier 2&3 services in the classroom

Person Responsible Michele Danowski (danowskm@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In addition to the above areas of focus, our school will continue to develop the area of increasing student attendance. We will be monitoring attendance and identifying anyone who falls below the 90th percentile. Those students identified will receive a letter and or phone call to inquire in any assistance is needed and a home visit by the school Social Worker will be conducted if there is no improvement.

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 who enter Freedom are welcomed to S.O.A.R. throughout their school career by integrating self control, on task behavior, achievement, and showing respect for themselves and others. School counselors collaborate with staff and families to meet individual student needs academically, socially, and emotionally. School leaders incorporate an open door policy and provide a comprehensive classroom problem solving curriculum K-5. Positive behaviors are reinforced and celebrated regularly with the community and families. Virtual communication is enhanced through FaceBook, Freedoms web page, Instagram, TEAMS and Schoology. Intensive support team members provide crisis intervention, data analysis and consultation. A certified therapist works weekly with individual students referred for support. To help create a more positive school environment, teachers and administrators created and posted virtual welcomes and tours of the classroom and 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.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00