

Polk County Public Schools

Hospital Homebound



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Hospital Homebound

1909 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Lisa Carr

Start Date for this Principal: 8/3/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Polk 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Hospital Homebound

1909 FLORAL AVE S, Bartow, FL 33830

[no web address on file]

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)
Combination School PK-12	No	0%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	47%

School Grades History

Year Grade		2013-14
---------------------------------	--	------------------------

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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 the Hospital Homebound Program is to provide eligible students with the materials and specialized instruction necessary to support progress toward graduation requirements.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Hospital Homebound is to create an environment that establishes opportunities for students to be college, career and community ready for life.

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
Williams, Deron	Principal	The School Leader will identify programs needs and resources (both material, instructional and personnel) that will best support each student and their teachers.
Carr, Lisa	Other	Senior Manager. Coordinates and oversees the operations of the Hospital Homebound Program including the 17 full time staff members and approximately 123 Part time teachers. Collaborates with families, Doctors, and school sites to place the student in the least restrictive setting allowing them to continue their education while enrolled in Hospital Homebound. Maintains open communication at all times between students, families, teachers and medical personnel. Develops an individual schedule for each student taking into account accommodations indicated on their IEP. Coordinates the school-wide testing program. Monitors and maintains grades and attendance for all enrolled students with a special focus on students with extra risk factors. Addresses individual student academic needs through virtual, teleclass or field teaching programs. Supports staff with ongoing Professional Development and implementation of new programs. Works with teacher on increasing the rigor in our classes and meeting the needs of all levels of learners.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/3/2018, Lisa Carr

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

16

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	6	2	2	6	9	3	10	10	22	13	11	13	9	116
Attendance below 90 percent	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	1	7	11	9	8	6	52
One or more suspensions	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	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	2	3	2	0	0	0	15

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	1	2	0	2	1	3	3	3	0	1	16

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	0	0	3	2	0	5	4	7	4	3	2	2	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	5	5	5	14	11	3	13	13	25	14	12	18	28	166
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	7	3	3	4	6	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	5	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	5	7	2	2	3	2	28

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	4	5	4	13	10	3	12	13	23	10	11	14	25	147

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	1	2	1	2	3	4	6	0	3	1	4	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4

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	5	5	5	14	11	3	13	13	25	14	12	18	28	166
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	0	7	3	3	4	6	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	5	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	5	7	2	2	3	2	28

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	4	5	4	13	10	3	12	13	23	10	11	14	25	147

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	1	2	1	2	3	4	6	0	3	1	4	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4

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	0%	61%	61%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	49%	54%	0%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	56%	59%	0%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	52%	52%	0%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	52%	56%	0%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	79%	78%	0%	68%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey															
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	48%	-48%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	47%	-47%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	48%	-48%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	42%	-42%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	73%	45%	28%	55%	18%
	2018	0%	43%	-43%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		73%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
10	2019	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	56%	-56%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	51%	-51%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	47%	-47%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	39%	-39%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	40%	-40%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	35%	-35%	46%	-46%
	2018	18%	34%	-16%	45%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	45%	-45%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	41%	-41%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	42%	-42%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	54%	-14%	67%	-27%
2018	0%	59%	-59%	65%	-65%
Compare		40%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	70%	-70%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	84%	-84%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	57%	-57%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	50%	-42%	61%	-53%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	62%	-62%
Compare		8%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	41%	-41%	56%	-56%
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	46	27		22							
HSP	50										
WHT	45			18							
FRL	40			27							
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	46	27		22							
HSP	50										
WHT	45			18							
FRL	40			27							
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	46	27		22							
HSP	50										
WHT	45			18							
FRL	40			27							

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	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	101
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	64%
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50

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	
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	32
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	34
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.

Due to COVID there was not any Statewide testing data for 2019. Based upon EWS attendance data our number of students less than 90% was 44% of our enrollment shown 116. This was considerably higher than the prior year. However, again this is due to the nature of our program and working with children actively treating for medical conditions.

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

Due to COVID there was not any State testing in 2019. The data did not present any results.

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.

Due to COVID there was not any State testing in 2019.

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

Due to COVID there was not any State testing in 2019. The EWS data shows a reduced number of students this year with 2 or more EWI.

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

Based upon the nature of our program the students entering already have educational gaps due to past attendance issues related to their health. 16 of 116 enrolled show EWS of two or more. Many of our students (33) also have been retained, with 5 being retained 2 or more times.

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

1. Higher student participation in testing
2. Improve student attendance/participation (when physically able to do so)
3. Intervene with remedial program (Edgenuity) at quarter and not wait until semester for Middle/High students
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Provide comprehensive educational services to students who are determined eligible for the Hospital Home Bound Program. Rule 6A-6.03020, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), identifies an HH student as a student who has a medically diagnosed physical or psychiatric condition that is acute or catastrophic in nature, or a chronic illness, or a repeated intermittent illness due to a persisting medical problem. The condition or illness must confine the student to home or hospital and restrict activities for an extended period of time.
The possibility of HH services should be explored when it is anticipated that a student will be absent from school for at least 15 school days., while under a physician's care because of sever, prolonged, or chronic illness.

Measurable Outcome: Students will successfully complete coursework based upon their Individualized Education Plan that enables them to follow the Pupil Progression Plan leading to promotion to the next level with the ultimate goal of graduation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lisa Carr (lisa.carr@polk-fl.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Review of scheduled course grades and progress at interim time and at the end of each marking period. If student is not passing a course reach out to the student and family and determine any barriers. If additional assistance is needed via one-on-one instructional support or course scheduling adjustments ensure they are completed. Provide appropriate remediation or grade recovery at the end of the academic quarter to increase success for the semester.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Upon early intervention and review the HH student will have a greater chance at academic success in their courses. Increased communication with students /families will ensure that additional support is provided when the student is not able to maintain due to additional health issues. Due to the mobility of students moving in and out of our program close monitoring of their academic success will ensure a smooth transition upon return to brick and mortar schooling.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review physician's medical referral for Hospital Housebound Eligibility guidelines. Obtain further information if needed for determination.
2. Review students' academic records and current academic status.
3. Assign course schedule and service delivery model based upon the student's medical condition and IEP Team suggestions.
4. Monitor student progress at specific times during the year. (interim and end of semester)
5. Modify student schedules or delivery model if evidence is presented that current plan is not enabling the student to be successful. (Via IEP Amendment)

Person Responsible Lisa Carr (lisa.carr@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Monitoring of student progress at Interim and end of quarter should also reduce the number of possible retentions in the future.

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.

Due to the nature of our program our students are confined to either their homes or the hospital because of their medical conditions. We do our best to accommodate the needs of each family and student through an open door policy. If they are able to visit our office and meet Tele class teachers and attend meetings we highly encourage it. There is weekly communication between all students and teachers. All of our families have our contact information and are welcome to reach out to us at anytime. The parents of all students are contacted at interim and end of each quarter regarding their student's progress. Each family has a teacher, staffing teacher and Senior Manager they can reach out to at anytime.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00