

Clay County Schools

Orange Park 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Orange Park Elementary School

1401 PLAINFIELD AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ope.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Tyler Wood

Start Date for this Principal: 9/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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)	31%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (89%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (73%)
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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Orange Park Elementary School

1401 PLAINFIELD AVE, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://ope.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)
Elementary School KG-6	No	23%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to always work collaboratively with all of our community resources and stakeholders. We will increase achievement among our students with opportunities surrounding learning that are relevant, rigorous, and will transcend beyond the boundaries of our school walls. Our working and learning environment will be built upon honesty, integrity and respect. With all of the above Orange Park Elementary will maximize student potential and also promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Orange Park Elementary exists to prepare lifelong learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring all applicable life skills. We will provide an experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children.

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
McCullough, Carole	Principal	Instructional leader of the school
Herndon, Suzanne	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in providing quality instructional leadership
Geeser, Molly	Teacher, K-12	
Bachmayer, Abby	Teacher, K-12	
Lusk, Allison	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/28/2020, Tyler Wood

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.*

5

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
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)	31%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (89%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (73%)
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	72	72	72	72	66	66	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Tuesday 9/29/2020

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	73	72	70	70	66	65	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	73	72	70	70	66	65	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	478
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	91%	65%	57%	88%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	75%	62%	58%	82%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	54%	53%	77%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	97%	70%	63%	87%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	85%	66%	62%	83%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	98%	56%	51%	79%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	100%	65%	53%	92%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(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	93%	68%	25%	58%	35%
	2018	96%	68%	28%	57%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	94%	64%	30%	58%	36%
	2018	90%	62%	28%	56%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	92%	62%	30%	56%	36%
	2018	87%	59%	28%	55%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
06	2019	85%	64%	21%	54%	31%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	96%	71%	25%	62%	34%
	2018	94%	70%	24%	62%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	99%	69%	30%	64%	35%
	2018	89%	66%	23%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	95%	64%	31%	60%	35%
	2018	89%	65%	24%	61%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	97%	70%	27%	55%	42%
	2018	95%	68%	27%	52%	43%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	100%	63%	37%	53%	47%
	2018	94%	64%	30%	55%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
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	69	70	58	86	85	91					
ASN	100			100							
BLK	83	77		95	85						
HSP	85	74		97	79						
MUL	94	71		94	100						
WHT	92	74	75	97	83	100	100				
FRL	84	69	70	95	85	95	100				
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	57	56	45	73	67						
ASN	100			100							
BLK	83	81		89	75						
HSP	96	83		92	92						
MUL	82	55		82	91						
WHT	91	77	85	92	84	74	96				
FRL	88	79	78	89	80	73	87				
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	63	76	69	56	60	60					
ASN	100	91		100	75						
BLK	83	56		94	94						
HSP	82	80		88	90						
MUL	90			80							
WHT	88	84	81	86	83	76	96				

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
FRL	91	71		83	73	73	95				

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	89
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	622
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	77
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	85
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	84
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	90
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	89
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	85
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.

SWD Achievement in ELA only 69% (but did increase by 12% from 57% in 2018. Last year we had several SWD students enroll at OPE with severe reading issues.

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

6th grade ELA achievement declined by 4% (from 89% in 2018 to 85% in 2019). We honestly believe this small decline is due to the fact that we are comparing different groups of 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.

5th grade Science saw the biggest gap when compared to the state science scores. OPE=100% proficient while state scored only 53% proficient. This is a very positive gap. :)

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

4th grade math achievement increased by 10% (2018=89%; 2019=99%). Teachers are comfortable and very effective using the Go Math curriculum. OPE 4th grade teachers teach to all modalities.

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

No true area of concern as data is very positive.

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

1. Increase student achievement in ELA to offset the negative effects of crisis learning in spring, 2020.
2. Increase student achievement in Math to offset the negative effects of crisis learning in spring, 2020.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While our scores from 2019 FSA are quite high, the baseline data from Fall 2020 iReady indicates there is a significant drop in student achievement. This is due to the crisis learning model of instruction and the fact that students haven't been in school for 5 months.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of students will increase reading achievement to levels that indicate on-grade level status as evidenced by iReady/Achieve 3000 end-of-year data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carole McCullough (carolyn.mccullough@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will use informal assessments to pin point the specific area of needed remediation and will differentiate instruction for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional practices and assessments included in the Reading Endorsement program support the strategy above.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Select and give informal assessments.
2. Using these informal assessments, in addition to iReady fall data, small groups will be formed based upon area(s) in need of remediation. Teachers will differentiate instruction taking place in each group.
3. Supplemental phonics resources will be purchased and used in small groups.

Person Responsible: Carole McCullough (carolyn.mccullough@myoneclay.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In order for students to thrive emotionally and academically they must feel safe. Our role - especially during the pandemic- is to ensure the safety of all students. Children have been out of school for at least 5 months. Coming back to brick and mortar - or connecting through OCO classes- students have to learn how to re-engage academically and socially.

Measurable Outcome: By spring, 2021, 90% of our students will indicate they feel safe at OPE.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Suzanne Herndon (suzanne.herndon@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will model and reinforce safety protocols and will have students collaborate and share ideas pertaining to school safety.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Modeling and collaboration are research- based & highly effective instructional strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide a pre-assessment with basic questions concerning school safety.
2. All adults will role model appropriate behaviors for maintaining a safe campus.
3. The guidance counselor and school resource officer will work with groups of students, promoting school safety.
4. The pre-test given in the fall will be replicated in spring to determine levels of comfort within out students.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While our scores from 2019 FSA are quite high, the baseline data from Fall 2020 iReady indicates there is a significant drop in student achievement. This is due to the crisis learning model of instruction and the fact that students haven't been in school for 5 months.

Measurable Outcome: 80% of students will increase math achievement to levels that indicate on-grade level status as evidences by iReady end-of-year data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Carole McCullough (carolyn.mccullough@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small groups will be formed based on data' instruction will be differentiated to meet each student's needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small groups and differentiated instruction are proven best practices.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Select and give informal assessments.
2. Using these informal assessments, in addition to iReady fall data, small groups will be formed based upon area(s) in need of remediation. Teachers will differentiate instruction taking place in each group.
3. Math instruction will include the use of manipulatives;

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.

Our laser focus this year will be on raising reading and math achievement and maintaining a safe learning environment. No other priorities at this time.

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.

Administrators at OPE place high regard to the idea of positive school culture and environment. Over the summer the two areas most used by teachers - the lounge and the workroom- were redecorated to promote a warm, home-like environment. Staff birthdays are celebrated monthly. Administrators stay late on a regular basis so that teachers can come talk about personal or professional concerns. Teams meet individually with administration once per month to discuss issues that are important to them. Intensive support has been provided to OCO teachers in the form of purchasing items needed to facilitate online learning and also bringing in experts from the district office to work along side our OCO teachers. Students enjoy a clean and inviting campus. CDC guidelines are being followed to the greatest extent possible. Students are given mask breaks throughout the day. Teachers are creative and provide high interest lessons for students. Administrators and the guidance counselor have an open door policy for staff and students. Parents are kept informed through multiple sources of information including an updated website, Peach Jar and FaceBoook. Pictures of students are shared regularly. Positive citizenship expectations are reinforced through a monthly program entitled SOAR. Our guidance counselor conducts SEL lessons in all classrooms. The Orange Park Police Department supports OPE sixth grade students through the DARE program.

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: Culture & Environment: School Safety	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00