

Orange County Public Schools

Lucious And Emma Nixon Academy Charter



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lucious And Emma Nixon Academy Charter

1780 MERCY DR, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://nixonacademyorlando.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Deidre Law

Start Date for this Principal: 1/17/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (32%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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 Orange 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	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Lucious And Emma Nixon Academy Charter

1780 MERCY DR, Orlando, FL 32808

<https://nixonacademyorlando.org/>

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-5	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	Yes	100%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

The mission of Lucious & Emma Nixon Academy Charter School is to foster pride in all students by achieving an optimum level of development and mastery in the cognitive, effective, and psychomotor domains through the STEAM education model.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be the top producer of successful students in the nation.

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
------	-------	---------------------------------

Lumpkin, Ardonnis	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage programs, activities and functions consistent with school policy and priorities. • Assume responsibility and accountability for planning, developing and implementing with and through the staff, programs, activities and functions designed to achieve school goals and school priorities. • Analyze programs, activities and functions under his/her supervision to identify disparities between "what is" (current condition) and "what ought to be" (desired condition) and working with and through people to develop plans to eradicate the disparities as they relate to school goals and district priorities. • Supervise and evaluate designated teachers and staff in terms of their performance and responsibilities in the achievement of school goals and district priorities. • Work with teachers and staff to identify problems and issues (disparities) for which they may need expertise and support services for their own training and development to effectively address the problems and issues (disparities). • Visible in his/her school community and is recognized as an educational leader who is responsive to the school's and community's needs. • Serve as a member of the school's Leadership Team and participate in the school's planning, development and evaluation. • Perform classroom walk-throughs to manage instructional support and alignment of professional learning. • Collaborate with teachers to ensure that achievement gaps are identified and capable of closing gaps amongst all sub-groups. Monitor data of all students and hold meetings with all instructional staff to support all students. • Responsible for compliance and supports for ELL and ESE students through visits and monitoring their progress. • Provide instructional coaching and mentoring for staff to support and grow teachers' pedagogy.
----------------------	-----------	--

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 1/17/2020, Deidre Law

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

6

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	Black/African American Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (32%) 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	20	17	25	18	16	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	0

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Wednesday 11/4/2020

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	28	34	35	34	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	2	4	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	4	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	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	28	34	35	34	17	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	4	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	4	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	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	28%	57%	57%	0%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	58%	58%	0%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	53%	0%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	20%	63%	63%	0%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	33%	61%	62%	0%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	48%	51%	0%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	0%	56%	53%	0%	50%	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	26%	55%	-29%	58%	-32%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	33%	57%	-24%	58%	-25%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		33%				
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	25%	62%	-37%	62%	-37%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	9%	63%	-54%	64%	-55%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	53%	-53%
	2018					
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
BLK	19			11	20						
FRL	26			26							
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
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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	126
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
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	17
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	26
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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 Math data component (20%) showed the lowest level of student performance. However that data component could not be compared and contrasted to previous year's student performance because this was the first year the school enrolled students in testing grades; thus there is no data to compare it to.

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

The school is unable to compare and contrast to previous year's student performance because this was the first year the school enrolled students in testing grades; thus there is no previous year's data available to determine the greatest decline from the prior year.

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 Math data component (20%) showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There is no historical trend data to compare it to, however contributing factors are viewed as follows:

- Students matriculating from early childcare centers with poor school readiness skills
- Lack of academic supports at home
- Inexperienced school leadership
- Novice teachers without the prerequisite classroom management skills to effectively manage and ameliorate students struggling and or disruptive students

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

Amongst the data received, the ELA data component (28%) showed the highest level of student performance. Again, due to it being the first year the school tested FSA grades, there is no data to compare it to in order, to contrast improvement.

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

The EWD data from Part 1(D) does not indicate any areas of concern (it show all zeros) which is probably due to this being the first year the school is testing FSA grades. However looking at internal data that identify possible areas of concern, I would identify "attendance below 90 percent enrolled" and "course failure of ELA" of areas that need addressing

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

1. Veteran school leadership to establish a strong structured academic culture
2. Recruitment and retention of highly effective teachers
3. Recruitment of additional paraprofessionals to assists teachers/students with phonics & phonemic awareness

4. Concentration on MTSS
5. Student Intervention and remediation

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional Leadership is the root from which all academic fruit is harvested. It dictates the academic agricultural process and impacts both the fidelity and fruitfulness of instructional processes and outcomes. It was identified as a critical needs area after noticing that leadership was trying to plant academic seeds in a untilled instructional field. The unstructured campus climate was unstable and did not support consistent student growth and predictable educational outcomes.

Measurable Outcome: The school wants to increase its ELA Achievement from 28% to 40% and its Math Achievement data from 20% to 40% as well

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ardonnis Lumpkin (ardonnis.lumpkin@ocps.net)

- READING:**
- Grades 4-5 uses Journey’s Literacy Toolkit
 - Grade 3 uses Journey’s Reading Toolkit
 - I-Ready

Evidence-based Strategy: MATH:
-Student growth will be monitored through I-Ready progress monitoring as well as teacher observation based on lessons.

- Go Math Intervention Tool-kit
- I-Ready Supplemental Lessons that require frequently monitored lessons

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The reading and math strategy indicated are researched based and are both identified as a best practice.

Action Steps to Implement

READING:
All students will receive literacy instruction in an uninterrupted 90-minute reading block utilizing the core series, Journey’s. The literacy block will include whole group, guided instruction, differentiation through literacy centers and targeted small group instruction based on student achievement levels (determined by I-Ready diagnostic). Students will receive additional instruction from classroom teachers using supplemental practice activities from I- Ready Teacher Took-Kit, Journey’s Literacy Toolkit, or Journey’s Reading Toolkit based on diagnostic and ongoing assessment results. Journey’s Intervention Toolkit will be used during small group sessions

Literacy skills will be incorporated cross-curricula. Grade level appropriate literacy standards will also be reinforced in in other content area classes such as Social Studies and Science classes.

Person Responsible: Ardonnis Lumpkin (ardonnis.lumpkin@ocps.net)

MATH
Hands-on center activities will be implemented as a means of connecting abstract concepts through the use of manipulatives and problem solving
Remedial math instruction will be provided through the core series, Go Math. Go Math Intervention will be used during small group sessions

Person Responsible Ardonnis Lumpkin (ardonnis.lumpkin@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

STUDENT INTERVENTION & REMEDIATION

READING

Tutoring: Students in target grades scoring a level 1 or 2 in Reading and/or as being in the lower quartile will receive afterschool tutoring sessions in a small group setting. Tutorials will take place twice each week for 90 minutes each session. Students will be grouped based on areas of deficiency identified through I-Ready Progress Monitoring data. Instruction will focus on comprehension and vocabulary strategies such as vocabulary development through word maps, utilizing context clues and implicit instruction on word parts such as prefixes and suffixes and root origins.

MATH

Tutoring: Targeted afterschool tutoring will be provided in Math for students with previous retentions, and students performing below grade level on I-Ready diagnostic assessments. Students will receive targeted instruction utilizing Triumph Learning Coach materials. Students unable to attend tutoring sessions, will receive small group instruction during class.

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 has had a recent public relations crisis that has created some doubt regarding the positive culture/environment that exist on campus.

However moving forward a positive school climate will be approached with the same three systematic pillars as all undertakings are on campus, which is Strategy, Discipline, and Time. The "Strategy" is to openly extend ourselves to all potential stakeholders (pupils, parents, professional, partners, providers and politicians) in a manner that promotes positive interactions and outcomes. This strategy sits on clear and communicated expectations regarding our mission/ goals as it relates to the academic and aspirational advocacy and advancement of all children in our care. The simple moto of "No Excuse, No Exceptions,

Learning Comes First" resounds and abounds. The intimacy of our small school campus (169 students) gives us the opportunity to better understand the needs and nuances of each child. That sense of awareness coupled with a sense of equal and fair care is hoped to positively metastasize throughout the campus environment as we move forward. How we demand dignity and respect from each other and hold others accountable for their attitudes, aptitudes and actions makes a difference.

The "Discipline" of the aforementioned three pillars is to stay the course and remain true to the spirit of the strategy despite any resistance or insistence to change the philosophy. The details of the strategy might have to be adjusted to meet situational factors that arise (such as shifting from face to face instruction during the pandemic to online instruction) but the spirit of the strategy (which should be developed in collaboration with stakeholders) must endure.

The "Time" component is what's necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of the positive culture that we're trying to establish. It gives us the the ability to intermittently reevaluate implementation measures and progress monitor action steps.

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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00