

Clay County Schools

Oakleaf Junior High



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oakleaf Junior High

4085 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://olj.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Wilnitra Dixon

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	49%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Clay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oakleaf Junior High

4085 PLANTATION OAKS BLVD, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://olj.oneclay.net>

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	32%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	67%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

Oakleaf Junior High School creates a positive learning community which promotes a culture of motivation, citizenship, and overall academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Oakleaf Junior High exists to prepare life long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Rousseau, Kristin	Principal	
James, Dustin	Assistant Principal	
Bucklin, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Rowe, Janet	Teacher, K-12	
Britt, Yalonda	Teacher, K-12	
Bradley, David	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/14/2020, Wilnitra Dixon

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.*

4

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

71

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	49%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	571	598	0	0	0	0	1169	
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	73	68	0	0	0	0	141	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66	58	0	0	0	0	124	

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	
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

Monday 9/14/2020

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	576	594	0	0	0	0	1170	
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	7	6	0	0	0	0	13	
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	78	174	0	0	0	0	252	

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

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	576	594	0	0	0	0	1170
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	7	6	0	0	0	0	13
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	78	174	0	0	0	0	252

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	1	0	0	0	0	1
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	61%	61%	54%	55%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	58%	54%	53%	58%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	49%	47%	46%	45%	44%
Math Achievement	67%	69%	58%	61%	69%	56%
Math Learning Gains	70%	63%	57%	57%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	56%	51%	48%	53%	50%
Science Achievement	69%	66%	51%	61%	60%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	81%	72%	77%	81%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(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
06	2019					
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	52%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	59%	-1%	52%	6%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	51%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	63%	62%	1%	56%	7%
	2018	67%	67%	0%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018	58%	68%	-10%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	63%	-1%	54%	8%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	54%	49%	5%	46%	8%
	2018	59%	52%	7%	45%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	66%	64%	2%	48%	18%
	2018	67%	67%	0%	50%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				

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

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	90%	-90%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	80%	3%	71%	12%
2018	82%	78%	4%	71%	11%
Compare		1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	65%	31%	61%	35%
2018	94%	66%	28%	62%	32%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	64%	36%	57%	43%
2018	98%	61%	37%	56%	42%
Compare		2%			

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	24	43	36	28	54	49	37	56	41		
ELL	21	53	56	25	63	71	17	76			
ASN	72	58		82	77		74	88	88		

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
BLK	52	55	49	51	63	56	58	78	67		
HSP	62	61	60	68	72	56	65	86	66		
MUL	68	61	47	77	77	73	79	85	70		
WHT	68	66	59	79	74	54	79	86	68		
FRL	51	55	45	58	66	56	55	76	60		
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	23	43	41	32	55	53	31	59			
ELL	20	57	54	33	57	43	40	42			
ASN	78	71	60	85	72	64	74	85	66		
BLK	53	58	48	51	52	47	62	79	56		
HSP	60	61	56	66	63	57	63	78	72		
MUL	62	65	71	70	65	59	68	82	72		
PAC	77	62		69	69						
WHT	67	63	55	71	68	65	76	86	68		
FRL	54	58	50	55	55	48	59	79	50		
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	22	42	41	23	39	35	28	47	58		
ELL	26	41	37	33	43	32	44	27			
ASN	67	55	69	75	64	67	73	91	69		
BLK	47	51	44	51	56	51	49	71	44		
HSP	54	51	43	54	53	35	55	71	52		
MUL	54	53	50	62	59	56	71	68	68		
PAC	55	40		67	45						
WHT	61	56	47	69	59	47	70	83	53		
FRL	44	51	45	48	52	45	49	69	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	646

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	77
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	59
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	64
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	70
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	57
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.

OLJ's lower quartile students showed the lowest performance. OLJ attempted to use an allocation as a reading coach, but student enrollment forced the teacher to maintain a regular classroom.

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

ELA lower quartile gains dropped 1 point. With the focus of the school being on small group instruction during the 2019-2020 year, our aspiration is to elevate achievement of our lower quartile students.

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.

Oakleaf Junior High achieves higher than the state average in each component.

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

Math learning gains increased from 62% to 70%. This improvement is caused by a math success lab that Oakleaf Junior High implemented. Students would be pulled to intensive tutoring throughout the day to improve achievement level.

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

Oakleaf Junior high will place a focus in the area of reading strategies through ELA classrooms.

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

1. Increase learning gains
2. Increase state assessment passing rates
3. Increase the number of students taking advanced/high school level classes
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If positive behavior support strategies and social emotional learning are implemented and practiced across all grade levels, an increase in desired student behavior will occur.
---	--

Measurable Outcome:	Oakleaf Junior High is aspiring to have 7% less students receive a disciplinary referral for the 2020-2021 school year.
----------------------------	---

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)
---	---

Evidence-based Strategy:	PBIS tier 1,2, and 3 interventions and the incorporation of social emotional learning.
---------------------------------	--

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student involvement in Social Emotional Learning has been shown to increase student achievement, increase attendance, increase high school graduation rates, and decrease student discipline data. PBIS tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions help students based on their individual needs to promote student success.
---	--

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of 7 Mindsets SEL
2. PBIS training for staff
3. Parent Involvement program.

Person Responsible	Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)
---------------------------	---

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As learning has been forced into a virtual setting for many students, Oakleaf Junior High will focus on true blended learning through the incorporation of technological engagement strategies/questioning in our classrooms.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome for Oakleaf Junior High is to show a 1% improvement in historical learning gains in ELA (61%) and Math (70%) on state assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities at Oakleaf Junior High will be centered around technological engagement in the classroom. District instructional coaches will provide support in virtual questioning and engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This selection is based on the number of students enrolled in OneClay Online and the need to effectively utilize our technological resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Learning Communities
2. Administrative Coaching Cycles
3. District based instructional coaching

Person Responsible Dustin James (dustin.james@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The OLJ Social Studies department is working in collaboration with the ELA/Reading department to implement reading strategies and cross-curricular practice in support of reading/ELA achievement levels.

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.

Oakleaf Junior High School depends on parental support and active participation in every aspect of our school's development. We have been fortunate to have many actively involved parents working alongside us, supporting our educational goals and objectives.

Parents are involved in all aspects, from the Parent Volunteer Organization, the School Advisory Committee, OLJH athletics, Science fair judges, chaperoning field trips, health screens, school pictures, and a host of other volunteer opportunities. Our school website keeps interested parents informed of upcoming school events. Parents are encouraged to create a Focus account where they can view student grades and attendance. At our virtual Open House parents are able to meet teachers and learn about teacher expectations and parents are encouraged to email teachers with any concerns. We maintain a Facebook social media connection as well some of our teachers maintaining class websites. Additionally there are school specific updates on the OneClay app.

The OLJ administrative team sends out a virtual news letter to parents every week (it is also posted on social media) to keep all stakeholders informed of current events and news within the school.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.