

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Chiles Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Chiles Elementary School

16541 TAMPA PALMS BLVD W, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Todd Connolly

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2013

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Hillsborough 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Chiles Elementary School

16541 TAMPA PALMS BLVD W, Tampa, FL 33647

[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)
Elementary School KG-5	No	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

To provide a nurturing and safe environment in which all children aspire to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become the district's leader in developing successful students.

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
Evans, Teresa	Principal	
Galfond, Ashley	Assistant Principal	
Murray, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
Capobianco, Carly	Teacher, K-12	
Hernandez, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
DelGiudice, Diana	Teacher, K-12	
LeBlanc, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Radulich, Melissa	Teacher, ESE	
Marsh, Alishia	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/15/2013, Todd Connolly

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.*

6

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	38%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (74%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	131	151	150	133	162	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	867
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	13	15	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
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	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
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	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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	164	166	136	168	156	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	929
Attendance below 90 percent	12	3	8	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	5	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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	82%	52%	57%	80%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	55%	58%	68%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	50%	53%	52%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	54%	63%	80%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	57%	62%	68%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	46%	51%	55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	50%	53%	81%	48%	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	76%	52%	24%	58%	18%
	2018	78%	53%	25%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	55%	25%	58%	22%
	2018	83%	55%	28%	56%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
	2018	76%	51%	25%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	54%	29%	62%	21%
	2018	77%	55%	22%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
	2018	82%	57%	25%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
	2018	81%	54%	27%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	51%	30%	53%	28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	52%	24%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	41	48	33	55	60	67	62				
ELL	63	71	72	82	77	57	86				
ASN	85	91		94	95		96				
BLK	79	62	45	72	77	71	77				
HSP	75	62	59	83	70	58	74				
MUL	81	76		73	81	64	77				
WHT	87	65	64	90	82	65	90				
FRL	71	66	58	76	76	63	78				
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	38	66	60	46	72	59	10				
ELL	75	80	84	82	82	60	78				
ASN	93	84		97	94		93				
BLK	69	60	41	69	73	70	62				
HSP	71	69	71	77	72	50	76				
MUL	87	74		71	74						
WHT	86	71	53	89	84	67	84				
FRL	70	67	59	74	80	69	71				
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	43	60	53	49	72	71	40				
ELL	68	68	59	74	71	70	68				
ASN	92	82		97	77		84				
BLK	65	52	37	60	55	46	55				
HSP	73	74	59	75	64	68	83				
MUL	74	71		82	71		67				
WHT	87	64	56	87	73	44	92				
FRL	68	60	41	69	61	51	77				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	602
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	72
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	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	69
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69

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	75
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	75
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	69
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.

Our lowest components in state testing data are Bottom Quartile Learning gains, in both ELA and Math, and in the performance of Students with Disabilities. These two categories share many of the same students. All of our SWD are in regular classes. Assistance is provided to our 86 SWD by three different ESE teachers. Scheduling these three teachers across six different grades levels and across different subject areas as needed is challenging every year. Our ESE students have a variety of different disabilities and each requires different levels of additional instruction. Other students that are typically in our bottom quartile are the 51 students with 504 plans. In the cases of SWD and students with 504 plans, the majority of instruction falls on the classroom teacher. Classroom teachers need additional professional development in definitive strategies that can be effective in reaching these students. Unfortunately, many of these students just need extra time to complete work. However, when given extra time, they then fall behind when the rest of the class moves on.

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

Declines were experienced in two subgroups: ELL and SWD. SWD issues were discussed in the previous question. Our ELL population continues to increase. Approximately one third of our students have a home language other than English. We have an experienced ESOL resource teacher, as well as three ESOL aides. However, they all speak Spanish. Our students speak 41 different languages at home. While 88 of them do speak Spanish, 39 speak Arabic, 24 speak Chinese, 24 speak Telegu, 17 speak Hindi, 12 speak Tamil, 12, speak Turkish, 11 speak Korean, 8 speak Mandarin, 7 speak Gujarati, 7 speak Urdu, and others speak additional languages. Many of our ELL students have just arrived in America and have no English. While ESOL teachers and aides can help, there are limitations when a child speaks one of these non-Spanish languages.

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.

N/A We are above the state and district in all areas.

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

Science showed significant improvement last year. I do not believe it was a single action. We have emphasized improved science instruction from grade K through 5 for a while. It is possible that this effort is beginning to pay off in the test scores of our 5th grade students. This is an ongoing, whole school effort to integrate science and STEM activities throughout the grade levels.

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

Attendance is becoming a bigger problem each year. We had 131 students that had more than 10 absences last year (in only 3 quarters of the school year). Students that arrive tardy are another issue (not in the EWS data). there were 111 students that were tardy more than 10 times in three quarters last year. This has been a change over time. And when students are tardy, parents do not seem to think it matters. This appears to be a change in our culture in an effort to follow rules and meet expectations. With COVID-19 concerns, attendance is likely to be a bigger problem in 2020-2021.

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

1. Bottom quartile achievement and learning gains
2. Achievement of SWD
3. Achievement of ELL students
4. Overall loss of learning during eLearning
5. Attendance/Tardies/COVID

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will increase use of academic collaboration and communication to enhance language acquisition and vocabulary development as we continue to close our achievement gaps--particularly those gaps related to students with disabilities and English Language Learners.
---	--

Measurable Outcome: All students will meet or exceed growth standards in iReady vocabulary outcomes.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Galfond (ashley.galfond@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers at all grades levels will implement a variety of AVID strategies which are based upon WICOR (writing, inquiry, collaboration, organization, and reading) in all subjects, throughout the day.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We are in the process of implementing AVID school wide. AVID provides a huge variety of grade level appropriate strategies to help all students engage and learn.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly training will take place at faculty meetings. All teachers will be trained in sanctioned AVID trainings. AVID (2-3 days).

Person Responsible Joanne Williams (joanne.williams@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will improve engagement, as defined by attention, interest, investment, and effort, in the work of learning via schoolwide implementation of AVID instructional practices.
Measurable Outcome:	The total number of "N"s on the citizenship side of the report card will be reduced. We will measure engagement by considering attention, interest, investment, and effort. These are noted on quarterly report cards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Galfond (ashley.galfond@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	AVID strategies are designed to improve engagement and learning through structures that require collaboration and communication. Schoolwide, AVID strategies such as more uniform use of folders, communication, and organization, will engage the disengaged (students and families).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As a school, we are currently implementing AVID throughout all grade levels. Training is ongoing and provides new and innovative strategies for classroom use.

Action Steps to Implement

AVID strategies will be evident in every classroom.

Person Responsible Teresa Evans (teresa.evans@hcps.net)

Parent communication and parent meetings/trainings will reach out to families of ELL and SWD.

Person Responsible Teresa Evans (teresa.evans@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will meet weekly to analyze and address data related to engagement, SEL, and achievement gaps in our 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.

Our positive school culture is based on a distributive leadership philosophy. Faculty committees meet regularly to review data, plan training, plan and implement strategies, and organize family events.

Committees evolve to meet the needs of our community.

Our PTA board meets regularly and is becoming more diverse and reflective of our community. The Board is particularly sensitive to financial issues families face and frequently adjust fund raising and other costs to help families. Events are scheduled at a variety of times/days. Uniforms scholarships are provided to students in need.

COVID impact: teachers will continue to meet regularly, but in smaller groups or via Zoom. Most activities such as family reading night, STEM night, and curriculum night will be postponed or cancelled. Our PTA Board has continued to meet throughout the spring and summer via Zoom. Our first general assemble meeting was held via Zoom, and 84 parents attended. This was much larger than usual.

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00