

Putnam County School District

Browning Pearce 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

www.putnamschools.org/o/bpes

Demographics

Principal: Yolanda Brady

Start Date for this Principal: 9/17/2018

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	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 (53%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Browning Pearce Elementary School

100 BEAR BLVD, San Mateo, FL 32187

www.putnamschools.org/o/bpes

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	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	42%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Putnam County School Board on 11/3/2020.

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.

The Bear Mission Statement
Browning Pearce Elementary School will:

-Empower teachers to create a challenging learning environment where students are expected to excel in all academic standards, encouraged to think critically and persevere, and are inspired to be creative problem solvers as they engage in collaborative tasks with their peers.

-Foster positive relationships between staff, students, families, and the community we serve by providing a variety of academic and social emotional supports.

-Maintain a safe and healthy learning environment where our students and their cultures are respected, their unique abilities are valued, and students have a voice in their educational pursuits so that they are ready for 21st Century demands.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Bear Vision Statement
At Browning Pearce, we are a unified family of learners who nurture & challenge each student to excel in the classroom & community.

The Bear Motto
EVERY CHILD. EVERY DAY.

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
Nelson, Beth	Principal	Conducts Business Between School and District Office School Improvement Plan Creates and Monitors Budgets Employee Evaluation Plans For Professional Development Attends Superintendent Advisory Council Meetings Attends City Council Meetings Hires and Manages Employees Leads Administration Team
Bellamy, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Parent and Family Engagement Plan PBIS Contact Threat Assessment Team Member EOP and Safety Public Relations Website Title 1 Audit Box Oversees Custodial Staff March of Dimes Contact
Jackson, Molly	Instructional Coach	K-2 i-Ready Diagnostics and Monitoring Coordinates Collaborative Classroom Program Monitors and Collects Data for K-2 PLC meetings Bus Discipline for K-2 School Advisory Council Chairperson Schedules K-2 interventions MTSS K-2
Ramirez, Donna	Other	Community and Family Liason Caring Classroom Coordinator ESOL and WIDA 504 Plans ESE Contact Attends MTSS meetings Mental Health Contact Behavior Threat Assessment Coordinator Cumulative Folders and Student Records Parent and Family Engagement Plan MTSS K-5
Bacon, Kan Dee	Instructional Media	Media Contact Technology Contact Science Contact Testing Coordinator Yearbook STEM Contact

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kite, Alyse	Administrative Support	Orders materials and supplies Monitors budgets Keeps personnel by position current Payroll
Metzger, Cheryl	Attendance/Social Work	Monitors Attendance Data Attendance Rewards Truancy Meetings Inputs Skyward Data
Watson, Lashonda	Instructional Coach	3rd-5th grade i-Ready Diagnostics and Monitoring Monitor 3rd-5th grade PLC meetings Instructional Literacy Contact 3rd Grade Portfolio Contact Keep Lowest Quartile Lists Current 3rd-5th Bus Discipline Interventions 3rd-5th Grade MTSS 3-5 Sunshine Committee

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/17/2018, Yolanda Brady

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

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	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 (53%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	117	94	86	81	88	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	559
Attendance below 90 percent	29	35	24	22	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	1	8	2	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	25	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	3	1	2	14	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	100	97	75	106	94	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	13	31	24	30	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	31	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	0	4	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	100	97	75	106	94	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	13	31	24	30	23	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	3	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	31	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	1	0	4	11	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	4	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	41%	46%	57%	39%	43%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	55%	58%	50%	50%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	54%	53%	35%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	51%	63%	49%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	56%	62%	47%	56%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	43%	51%	30%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	41%	53%	30%	37%	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	44%	41%	3%	58%	-14%
	2018	36%	40%	-4%	57%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	36%	43%	-7%	58%	-22%
	2018	42%	38%	4%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	36%	42%	-6%	56%	-20%
	2018	32%	39%	-7%	55%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	46%	9%	62%	-7%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	53%	-8%	64%	-19%
	2018	55%	50%	5%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	52%	44%	8%	60%	-8%
	2018	41%	48%	-7%	61%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	37%	38%	-1%	53%	-16%
	2018	29%	42%	-13%	55%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
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	25	57	68	32	49	48	38				
ELL	35	65		40	59		50				
BLK	23	46	47	37	54	47	13				
HSP	39	70	82	42	45		60				
MUL	64			64							
WHT	46	60	71	59	63	55	51				
FRL	38	57	67	49	58	49	44				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	30	36	28	30	48	52	23				
ELL	19	29		35	52		17				
BLK	22	31	22	35	42	35	11				
HSP	32	39		41	51	30	17				
MUL	53			47							
WHT	47	49	45	54	50	44	45				
FRL	37	41	33	44	47	38	28				
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	17	17	14	25	28	25	11				
ELL	16	44		36	44						
BLK	24	48	35	39	39	14	13				
HSP	32	41		46	47		18				
MUL	45			46							
WHT	46	54	35	55	50	37	40				
FRL	35	50	37	45	44	26	31				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	427
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	51
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	
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	57

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
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	58
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	53
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.

The 2019 data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA reading proficiency. The percentage grew from 39% to 41% but is significantly below the state average of 57%. Systems are in place for improvement and the trend is that data is improving. Every grade level has an intervention block and every child is placed in a group according to what the data says they need.

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

Based on 2019 data, the main seven components that make up the school grade all increased from the prior year. The data from the fourth graders who are now 5th graders showed a decline, ELA was 42% in 2018 and 36% in 2019. Math was 55% in 2018 and 45% in 2019. The team was made up of 6

teachers and 2 of the teachers were new to the team. There were changes to the curriculum, administration, and support services.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap is ELA proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest quartile in ELA it grew from 34% to 67%. There were interventions such as SIPPS, ACT, and LLI put into place. Third grade had a scheduled intervention block and placed students in like groups for the various intervention programs. There was a school wide effort to create ELA standards focus boards.

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

Decreasing the amount of level 1's in the core tested areas of ELA, Math and Science.

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. African American subgroup
3. Math proficiency
4. Science proficiency.
5. Decreasing the amount of level 1's in the core tested areas of ELA, Math and Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Reading proficiency is the primary area of focus for our school in addition to our lowest performing subgroup (Black/African American Students) Our lowest school grade component was reading proficiency at 41%. The students in our Black/African American subgroup were at 23% reading proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: The goal is to increase overall reading proficiency to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: There will be a focus on creating strong reading structures using our Tier 1 reading resources and programs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: FSA scores and information from the needs assessment/analysis information on the CIMS site were resources that were used to determine that ELA proficiency should be an area of focus for Browning Pearce Elementary.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of Center for Collaborative Classroom reading curriculum in grades K-2.
2. Implementation of district ELA pilot program, grades 3-5.
3. K-5 intervention time on the master schedule and instructional coaches are aiding teachers in placing students in differentiated groups.
4. Teachers will participate in weekly PLCs facilitated by our instructional coaches and the leadership team to engage in systematic data review sessions.
5. Utilize quality literacy programs: SIPPS, LLI, Open Court, Smarty Ants, Imagine Learning, i-Ready, and AR.
6. Mrs. Bellamy, the assistant principal, will track progress focused on improving the reading proficiency of our Black/African American subgroup using EWS data and i-Ready. Independent reading progress of the subgroup will be encouraged.
7. Utilize TSSSA funds for a Student Success Mentor, Community Family Liaison, and Remedy tutors to support students' academic and SEL needs.
8. Provide ongoing literacy PD with TSSSA funds.

Person Responsible: Beth Nelson (bnelson@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Students scoring level 1 on FSA in all three of the core subjects tested is a concern for BPES. We plan to utilize all of the tools the district provides in order to monitor progress throughout the year. Diagnostics in i-Ready, standards mastery tests in ELA and math, as well as periodic science assessments using a new platform called USA Test Prep will be utilized. Teachers will be assigned to the lowest performing ELA students during intervention times. Five academic tutors will be carefully scheduled to provide academic supports.

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 holds advisory council meetings every other month and invites stakeholders proximal to the school. The principal meets with broad stakeholder groups and shares pertinent information at the advisory meetings.

Current information is posted on the the school website. School Messenger and Remind are used to communicate important information to families. Our school promotes a positive and safe atmosphere through our BPES Facebook page. The school publishes a monthly newsletter to send home with students. The principal sends out a weekly message to the staff. Daily announcements are made to celebrate student success, remind everyone of our SUPER (Safe United Productive Engaged Respectful) character message, and to share current events.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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