

Bay District Schools

Deer Point 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

Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, Panama City, FL 32404

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Rebecca Reeder

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2020

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)	57%
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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Deer Point Elementary School

4800 HIGHWAY 2321, 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;">71%</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;">20%</p>

School Grades History

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

Deer Point Elementary will work collaboratively to ensure the success of all students and staff through engaging, rigorous, and relevant learning activities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Deer Point Anglers are respectful, independent and responsible leaders.

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
Reeder, Rebecca	Principal	
Knight, Jillian	School Counselor	
Thornton, Kaila	Teacher, K-12	
Hudson, Crystal	Assistant Principal	
Dagen, Elizabeth	Teacher, ESE	
Whitaker, Joanna	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/20/2020, Rebecca Reeder

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.*

26

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

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)	57%
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: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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	84	74	87	78	86	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	18	17	10	12	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
One or more suspensions	2	3	7	2	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	2	2	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	8	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	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	89	106	81	102	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	13	14	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	17	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	4	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	89	106	81	102	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	571
Attendance below 90 percent	17	9	13	14	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	17	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	4	4	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	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	56%	55%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	59%	58%	48%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	57%	53%	46%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	56%	63%	54%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	45%	54%	62%	48%	55%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	24%	42%	51%	42%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	53%	53%	60%	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	57%	61%	-4%	58%	-1%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	57%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	58%	-8%	58%	-8%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	45%	50%	-5%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
	2018	56%	63%	-7%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	59%	-15%	64%	-20%
	2018	63%	59%	4%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	60%	-9%
	2018	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	61%	54%	7%	53%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
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	39	35	24	34	16	50				
BLK	38	38		48	31						
MUL	46			38							
WHT	57	63	47	54	45	28	55				
FRL	52	58	42	46	40	18	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	30	30	38	41	54	39	20				
BLK	26	38	38	27	48	50					
MUL	65	38		76	69						
WHT	54	49	42	56	63	43	47				
FRL	43	44	39	46	58	37	33				
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	28	44	55	29	38	31	20				
BLK	26	38		33	50						
HSP	73			45							
MUL	42	55		47	27						
WHT	59	47	47	56	50	45	62				
FRL	46	48	48	46	48	40	38				

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	
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	
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	39
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
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	50
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	45
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.

4th grade math achievement 44%. This is a decline of 19% (cohort decline of 1%) (trend-math achievement declined across the school, district, and state in all grade levels)
Possible contributing factors-less focus on math last year as opposed to previous year.

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

4th grade math achievement decline of 19%
Subgroup MUL decline of 38% in math achievement

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.

Math lowest 25th percentile
(Fewer students receiving math MTSS in comparison to ELA. There are fewer options to provide T3 MTSS in math. The length of math lessons may reduce the amount of time needed for small group differentiation.)

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

5th grade science +16%
Subgroups in science (SWD +30%, FRL +27%)
New Actions- refined instructional practice

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

5th grade Level 1 on statewide assessment

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

1. Math Achievement (lowest 25th)
2. Math Achievement subgroup (SWD, BL, MUL)
3. 4th grade math achievement
4. 4th grade ELA achievement
5. ELA lowest 25th

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA/Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%, SWD, and BLK
 Increase student learning gains, in the area of reading and math, by identifying specific student needs using appropriate data to plan and provide interventions and instruction. Deer Point Elementary is below the District and State averages in lowest quartile students scores on the FSA. Additionally, our SWD and BLK subgroups are not meeting Learning gains expectations. Increasing the students comprising the lowest 25% making learning gains, our school will increase our number of students that will be proficient in ELA and Math.

Measurable Outcome:

1. Increase Math learning gains of the lowest quartile from 24% to 29%, which is below the state and district average for the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 SYs.
2. Increase ELA learning gains of the lowest quartile from 47% to 52%, which is below the state and district average for the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 SYs.
3. Increase Math and ELA learning gains of SWD from 34% to 39% and 39% to 44%, respectively.
4. Increase Math and ELA learning gains of BLK subgroup from 31% to 36% and 38% to 43%, respectively

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. MTSS pull out support.
2. MAP testing/monitoring of lowest quartile students.
3. ESE students are gaining access to the Eureka curriculum.
4. Increasing support in Inclusion Classes via ESE teachers.
5. Monitoring grade-level and instructional-level progress through IEPs and goals.
6. Professional Development for teachers in the area of accelerated learning strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our lowest 25% of students is comprised of 13% students receiving MTSS, 47% ESE, and 4% BLK. By providing additional MTSS and ESE supports, and using accelerated learning strategies and Eureka curricula with fidelity, our SWD, Lowest 25%, and BLK subgroups are expected to receive more focused grade-level instruction and supports, and their learning gains will meet expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Push-in inclusion ESE teachers to monitor and work with students 1:1 and in small group.
2. MTSS support for those needing 1:1 and small group interventions.
3. MAP testing/monitoring of all students.
4. LiM Data chats with students, parents, within PLCs, to include goal setting.
5. Ongoing PD in accelerated learning and Eureka curricula.
6. Full Eureka curricula implementation with fidelity -- monitored and implemented through PLCs, classroom walk-throughs, learning cycles, student data, and common assessments.

Person Responsible Rebecca Reeder (reederl@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus	Behavior
Description and Rationale:	Deer Point Elementary will reduce disruptive behavior and build a positive school climate through continued school-wide implementation of character education and behavior improvement initiatives.
Measurable Outcome:	Deer Point averaged 26 disciplinary referrals per month during the 2019-2020 school year. Incidents of defiance/disrespect and inappropriate behavior (over 40%) will decrease by 15%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Crystal Hudson (hudsocj@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CAST Expectations, BDS 360, Merrell's Strong Kids, Leader in Me, ZooU.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Leader in Me is an evidenced-based, comprehensive school improvement model that empowers students with the leadership and life skills they need to thrive. By teaching, modeling, and expecting students to live the 7 habits of the LiM model, intrinsic motivation to make appropriate choices and treat all with respect should result in our meeting discipline reduction targets. Evidence will include discipline data and LiM implementation data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will work with teachers to establish classroom managed vs. office managed behaviors.
2. Teachers will deliver daily lessons on character education from the LiM model.
3. Teachers will use class Dojo to reinforce behavior that meets our CAST expectations, and the 7 Habits.
4. Teachers will implement a classroom reward system to recognize students who are following the CAST expectations, and 7 Habits.
5. Teachers will differentiate classroom vs. office managed behaviors in FOCUS.
6. PROMISE room focuses on recovery using the BDS 360 ZooU program and lunch bunch skills groups.
7. Tier II students receive weekly social skill lessons using the Strong Kids curriculum.
8. Behavior Triad team will provide interventions, skills groups, and support for teachers and students.

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.

**Professional Development in Accelerated Learning to support teachers in making instructional decisions after students have lost instructional time (Hurricane Michael and COVID).
Early identification for students who show a need for additional instructional support.**

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.

Parent partnership in their child's education is paramount at Deer Point Elementary. Administration and teachers communicate with all stakeholders in a variety of ways.

Classroom DOJO, classroom newsletters, Parent Portal, school-wide digital newsletter, LINK alerts, and Peachjar digital flyers, will provide families a variety of means by which they may become informed of school events. Facebook is also used to push out information to parents and community members. Numerous events are planned throughout the year to encourage parents and community to participate and support the school:

- * Music in School Week
- * Art nights
- * Virtual Open House
- * A fall and a spring Book Fair
- * AFIT (a parent-teacher organization)
- * STEM Night
- * Chick-Fil-A Spirit Nights, Whataburger, Chill Yogurt Spirit Night throughout the year
- * Spring Festival
- * Community-wide math night

The district's Parent Portal provides families with real-time information regarding student achievement and attendance. Each family is required to establish an account through which they may view students' grades and communicate with teachers.

Conferences are regularly scheduled with families to discuss academic, social, behavioral, and attendance concerns. Parent contact is encouraged through a number of methods including Classroom DOJO, Parent Portal, emails, phone and mail.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------