

Putnam County School District

Palatka Jr Sr High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Palatka Jr Sr High School

302 MELLON RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/phs

Demographics

Principal: Cathy Oyster

Start Date for this Principal: 12/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Palatka Jr Sr High School

302 MELLON RD, Palatka, FL 32177

www.putnamschools.org/o/phs

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)
High School 7-12	Yes	95%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	50%

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 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.

We will inspire every student to think, to learn, to achieve, to care and to become a successful and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Palatka High School will provide an inspirational learning culture that will prepare students for college and career success in a global society.

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
Stout, James	Principal	Maintaining a safe environment for all students and staff; observing teachers and classroom instruction daily to provide on going feedback to teachers; monitoring teacher lesson plans to ensure that students are receiving standards based instruction at the appropriate instructional level; communicating regularly with families and the community to ensure that all stakeholders are involved and providing input to school-based decisions; managing the instructional support staff to ensure that students' academic and social/emotional needs are met daily.
Chaires, Michael	Assistant Principal	Supporting the leadership team at school by focusing on school-wide goals and expectations; providing appropriate supervision of students to maintain a safe learning environment for all students and staff; observing teachers and classroom instruction to provide on going feedback to teachers; participating in parent conferences/MTSS/IEP meetings to ensure that students are receiving the support needed to be successful.
Purifoy, Lamar	Assistant Principal	Supporting the leadership team at school by focusing on school-wide goals and expectations; providing appropriate supervision of students to maintain a safe learning environment for all students and staff; observing teachers and classroom instruction to provide on going feedback to teachers; participating in parent conferences/MTSS/IEP meetings to ensure that students are receiving the support needed to be successful.
Gieselman, Aaron	Assistant Principal	Supporting the leadership team at school by focusing on school-wide goals and expectations; providing appropriate supervision of students to maintain a safe learning environment for all students and staff; observing teachers and classroom instruction to provide on going feedback to teachers; participating in parent conferences/MTSS/IEP meetings to ensure that students are receiving the support needed to be successful.

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Thursday 12/1/2016, Cathy Oyster

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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 7-12
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (42%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: D (35%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	287	244	233	1065
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	134	127	78	455
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	104	78	55	375
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	6	9	33
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	3	3	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	100	89	101	414
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	0	0	0	98

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	137	104	93	72	406	

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	7	8	6	1	22	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	7	5	35	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321	262	280	211	1074
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	82	93	74	353
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	89	94	55	348
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	78	82	43	313
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	89	84	91	409

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	62	39	52	33	186

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	9	12	6	2	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	6	7	39

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	0	0	321	262	280	211	1074
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104	82	93	74	353
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	89	94	55	348
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	78	82	43	313
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145	89	84	91	409

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	62	39	52	33	186

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	9	12	6	2	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	6	7	39

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	35%	31%	56%	28%	28%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	39%	34%	51%	40%	40%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	27%	42%	42%	41%	41%
Math Achievement	37%	25%	51%	36%	27%	49%
Math Learning Gains	42%	43%	48%	42%	27%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	42%	45%	29%	28%	39%
Science Achievement	48%	39%	68%	52%	53%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	47%	49%	73%	62%	57%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(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
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	33%	41%	-8%	55%	-22%
	2018	34%	38%	-4%	53%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				
10	2019	36%	41%	-5%	53%	-17%
	2018	27%	38%	-11%	53%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	54%	-10%	67%	-23%
2018	29%	58%	-29%	65%	-36%
Compare		15%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	51%	-3%	70%	-22%
2018	52%	53%	-1%	68%	-16%
Compare		-4%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	49%	-9%	61%	-21%
2018	17%	43%	-26%	62%	-45%
Compare		23%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	43%	-11%	57%	-25%
2018	32%	50%	-18%	56%	-24%
Compare		0%			

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	21	30	22	43	31		58	32		68	7
ELL											
BLK	21	31	22	32	41	21	34	33		86	30
HSP	28	35	36	39	30		45	45		71	60
WHT	47	47	40	40	43	38	64	61		85	45
FRL	27	34	26	36	40	27	45	41		82	28
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	27	38	31	34	68	64	29	63		38	24
BLK	17	30	25	21	50	55	26	33		62	29
HSP	28	39		22	45		14	73		63	30
WHT	43	44	42	36	40	30	36	75		72	51
FRL	27	37	32	27	47	52	27	53		64	37
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	6	32	31	34	50			32		32	7
BLK	12	40	45	14	30	29	25	39		52	22
HSP	30	44		50	50					60	
WHT	39	40	36	46	48	30	62	74		71	52
FRL	21	39	42	32	42	33	44	57		54	28

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	20

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	20
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
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	43
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	

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	51
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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 lowest components are ELA BQ at 30% and Mathematics BQ at 31%. ELA achievement was the lowest achievement component at 35%. Factors that contributed to last year's low performance was incoming students who were historically below grade level in reading and math and teachers who lacked math content knowledge.

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

The component with the greatest decline was Mathematics BQ. Mathematics BQ declined from 45% in 2018 to 31% in 2019. The factors that contributed to this decline are incoming students who are historically below grade level and teachers who lacked math content knowledge.

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 component with the greatest gap is social studies. The state social studies percentage is 73% and the school percentage is 47%. Another significant split is in ELA Achievement. The state average is 56% and the school average is 35%. The factors that contributed to this gap are social studies

teachers who lacked engaging instructional strategies and students who are historically below grade level in reading.

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

The component with the most improvement is science. Science improved from 29% in 2018 to 48% in 2019. In order to achieve this improvement our Biology teachers participated in district PLC's to discuss standards and instructional strategies.

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

The freshman class has the highest number of referrals compared to other grade levels in all EWS categories.

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

1. ELA and Mathematics Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2. ELA Achievement
3. Math Achievement
4. Social Studies Achievement
5. Acceleration Points

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Daily lesson targets will be derived from the standards of each class. Students will be given a success criteria that is a task at the same taxonomy (or above) that of the standard. This task will show the teacher and the student if the student is progressing toward standard mastery or if the student has mastered the standard. All students will benefit including our subgroups falling below 41%.

Our overall Federal Index is 41% with 4 subgroups falling below 41%. Subgroups to be addressed include: African American 35%, Students with Disabilities 35%, ELL 20% and Economically Disadvantaged 39%.

Based on this data, efforts will focus on a school wide implementation of strategies.

Measurable Outcome: If we focus on improving target/task/standard alignment in every classroom our student learning gains and achievement will increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Stout (jstout@my.putnamschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will create learning targets and success criteria at the same or greater taxonomy of the standards being addressed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement will increase when students are provided daily lessons that are designed from the standards that are taught. When students are provided the daily learning targets and success criteria, they know what is expected each day and will know where they are in their own learning as they complete the success criteria for each learning target.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide school-wide professional development through Learning Sciences International (LSI) to support teachers with developing standards based learning targets and success criteria.
2. The leadership team will conduct frequent conditions walks and rigor walks to monitor target/task alignment with the standards using the Trend Tracker from LSI.
3. Student progress will be monitored using district interim assessments to determine how our students are progressing toward standards mastery.

Person Responsible

James Stout (jstout@my.putnamschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

More guidance will be given to students in the 9th grade to help in their adjustment to high school and the increased expectations of Palatka High School.

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.

Palatka High School coordinates and integrates parental involvement programs and activities that teach parents how to assist and support their children at home through phone messages using the School Messenger callout system, digital marquee, school newsletters, Remind 101 application, Google Classroom, Project Praise, ESOL support, childcare services and bus transportation for our students with children of their own. Parents are made aware of the school's Title I program and the nature of Title I during our Fall open house, Title I Annual Summary Meeting, and SAC meetings. Parents are given a copy of the Title I Bi-fold Handout and participate in the Parent Self Survey on Promoting Positive Educational Experiences. In order to build capacity for strong parental support, Palatka High School offers the following activities: Advanced Placement Parent Night, Financial Aid and Scholarship Meeting, District-Wide College Night, Freshman Orientation, Junior and Senior Class Parent Nights, and District-Wide Career Fair. To build ties between parents and teachers, our school requires documentation of positive parent contact, implements MTSS, and encourages use of the Skyward Parent Portal. Teachers are given professional development through data and department head meetings and are trained in the Marzano Teacher Evaluation Model.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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