

Bay District Schools

Parker 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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Coan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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	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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Parker Elementary School

640 S HIGHWAY 22 A, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">57%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Parker Elementary School (PES) seeks to create a challenging learning environment that encourages high expectations for success of all students through developmentally appropriate instruction that acknowledges individual differences and learning styles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of all Parker Elementary School stakeholders is to meet the needs of all students by granting them diverse educational opportunities by means of:

- Instruction designed to prepare students for mastery of Florida State Standards.
- Learning that develops skills for students to improve in language arts, mathematics, and school safety.
- Opportunities to exhibit responsibilities and promote self-esteem.
- Teamwork to become productive citizens.

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
Coan, Christopher	Principal	Principal of School
Barron, Christen	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of School, MTSS, Discipline
Hurst, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	MTSS Behavior and Academic Coach
Turner, Ruth	Teacher, K-12	KDG Team Lead
McGee, Marian	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade Team Lead
Hitzeman, Isabelle	School Counselor	Guidance PreK-2. MTSS Academic
Sapp, Minnie	Teacher, K-12	Special Area Team Lead
Marcino, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade Team Lead
Henson, Teresa	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Lead
Been, Cindy	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade Team Lead
Segrest-Adams, Katrina	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade Team Lead
Beanland, Candice	Teacher, K-12	
Siler, Amber	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Chris Coan

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.*

3

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

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	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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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	84	108	92	98	95	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	8	31	25	31	16	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	9	14	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA	0	5	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	4	9	10	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	97	83	90	99	107	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	19	30	30	25	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	7	4	10	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	10	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	37	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	3	3	9	28	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	3	4	2	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	10	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	97	83	90	99	107	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	19	30	30	25	38	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	7	4	10	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	10	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	9	37	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	3	3	9	28	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	3	4	2	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	2	2	10	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	43%	55%	57%	41%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	59%	58%	60%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	57%	53%	66%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	36%	56%	63%	42%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	48%	54%	62%	46%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	42%	51%	45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	49%	53%	53%	43%	44%	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	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
	2018	39%	57%	-18%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	58%	-25%	58%	-25%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	56%	-9%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	30%	62%	-32%	62%	-32%
	2018	38%	63%	-25%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	59%	-16%	64%	-21%
	2018	56%	59%	-3%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	60%	-23%
	2018	43%	57%	-14%	61%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	55%	54%	1%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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	26	48		15	21	23	30				
ELL											
BLK	32	56		34	37		30				
HSP	52			33							
MUL	50	45		44	55						
WHT	42	51	54	33	51	40	56				
FRL	43	53	63	35	47	35	45				
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	48	44	25	49	59	45				
BLK	30	53		31	50		30				
HSP	76	70		71	70						
MUL	61			44							
WHT	47	61	55	42	56	62	64				
FRL	41	57	56	35	55	68	55				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	23	58	57	29	41	39	15				
BLK	26	59	69	23	39	35	35				
HSP	58	67		54	58						
MUL	38	80		43	45						
WHT	45	58	65	47	49	50	38				
FRL	38	59	64	38	46	44	36				

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	43

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	21
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	27
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	21
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1

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	38
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	35
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
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	47
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Math Proficiency, Math Lowest 25%tile, Reading Proficiency. Historically, Parker Elementary's proficiency rate has been lower than learning gains. This cohort of students in 4th / 5th grade were weaker in basic Mathematics facts, causing the lower growth.

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

Math Lowest 25%tile... This cohort of students in 4th / 5th grade were weaker in basic Mathematics facts, causing the lower growth.

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.

Proficiencies in ELA and Math. Our students have traditionally underperformed from the state average in 3+ on FSA. The social, academic and emotional needs of the community have outweighed the academic advancement.

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

ELA - Lowest 25%tile. Our ELA teachers implemented a new Reading program in 2018 and continued in 2019. Moving to a more rigorous instruction, thus implemented across grade levels for 2020 (no data due to pandemic) and continuing in 2021.

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

Improving proficiency in ELA and Math. Increasing the Rigor in instruction.

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

1. Social - Emotional Need after 2 Hurricanes, and a Global Pandemic
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Math Proficiency
4. Learning Gains in ELA and Math
5. Learning gains in L25%tile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Parker Elementary community has had 3 major events in the last 3 years that have impacted instruction. October 10, 2018 Cat 5 Hurricane Michael devastated our community. March 2020, the world was shut down from the Pandemic. Currently our school community is recovering from tremendous flooding from Hurricane Sally that dumped 20+ inches of rain.

Measurable Outcome: Improve student attendance from 88% attendance rate to 92% attendance with all of the new concerns with online learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Parent conference, home visits, using our Mental Health Triad team to improve student / family morale.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This year our school was given a Mental Health triad Team, as a part of the Restart Grant. These team members are assisting staff concerns and students concerns as we attempt to go back to normal and consistency.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Having our students in class is paramount to allowing them to receive the rigorous instruction provided by our teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	SY 2019 - 2020 we had 254 ODRs with a OSS rate of 21.83 days. This can be linked to the prior focus of Social and Emotional Learning needs for our students. We are going to reduce this to under 15 days / 100 students...
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of our Guidance and Mental Health team to conduct more small group therapy for students that are not adapting to the school environment. To also give structure to our families needing the support at home.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Missing class time will not allow the students to receive the rigorous instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the data this is an all encompassing area of need for the majority of the student population. The Economically disadvantaged numbers mirror our school numbers
Measurable Outcome:	The measurable outcome is to increase all areas by 10% or more.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Coan (coancm@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Developed PD for teachers, implementing rigorous classroom instruction for in person and virtual instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students have missed several months of instruction due to Hurricane MICHAEL and SALLY, in addition to the Global Pandemic of 2020. We need to accelerate our student learning to make up the lost time, while enriching the prior skills missed...

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Classroom walkthroughs, PLC meetings, enhanced PD with teachers and staff for delivering rigorous instruction while balancing the Social Developmental needs of our community.

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 will conduct two separate Title I Annual meetings at different times to accommodate the needs of the parents. One of the meetings will be in the evening virtually where parents can get information about the school and the positive school culture. Additional meetings and times will be added in alignment with other parental involvement activities scheduled in the first month of the school year. The parents will be notified via flyers sent home with each child, school newsletters sent out by administration, school wide Class Dojo alerts, and class newsletters. Information will be placed on social media, as well as the marquee in the front of the school.

We also partner with civic groups like Parker City Government, the Parker Lodge of the Shriners for positive rewards for students, as well as our title sponsor of Hiland Park Baptist Church, which does our Shoes for SOles program, providing students Blessings in a Backpack weekly, mentoring for a lot of our students, and support for teachers to effectively complete their jobs with the supplies they need.

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: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Economically Disadvantaged	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00