

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Clark 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

Clark Elementary School

19002 WOOD SAGE DR, Tampa, FL 33647

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Delilah Rabe IR O

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	43%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 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

Clark Elementary School

19002 WOOD SAGE DR, 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 PK-5	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

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.

Clark Elementary School will provide an educational atmosphere where all students are able to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Clark Elementary School will provide all students the knowledge and skills necessary to reach their highest potential.

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
Rabeiro, Delilah	Principal	Oversee the day to day operation of the school.
Addison, Aimee	School Counselor	
Hawkins, Michelle	Teacher, ESE	ESE Specialist
	Psychologist	
Humbert, Shelby	SAC Member	SAC Chairperson
Goff, Christine	School Counselor	
Libby, Nicole	Assistant Principal	
McNish, Judy	Attendance/Social Work	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Delilah Rabe IR O

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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)	43%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: A (63%) 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	103	141	127	143	112	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	751
Attendance below 90 percent	4	17	6	11	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	20	13	32	4	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
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

Friday 10/30/2020

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	151	133	144	127	136	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	819
Attendance below 90 percent	18	13	8	11	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
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	1	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	3	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	

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	151	133	144	127	136	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	819
Attendance below 90 percent	18	13	8	11	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
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	1	17	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	2	3	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	75%	52%	57%	68%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	55%	58%	61%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	50%	53%	47%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	54%	63%	73%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	85%	57%	62%	71%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	46%	51%	48%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	50%	53%	71%	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	74%	52%	22%	58%	16%
	2018	76%	53%	23%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	55%	23%	58%	20%
	2018	71%	55%	16%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	67%	54%	13%	56%	11%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	54%	21%	62%	13%
	2018	76%	55%	21%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	88%	57%	31%	64%	24%
	2018	80%	57%	23%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	60%	21%
	2018	71%	54%	17%	61%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	51%	21%	53%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	69%	52%	17%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	31	39	30	41	61	53	40				
ELL	75	79		84	90	75	79				
ASN	93	85		99	96		92				
BLK	51	44	29	58	68	52	40				
HSP	65	64	47	82	86	82	70				
MUL	87	77		87	92						
WHT	83	70		87	85		94				
FRL	61	55	39	71	76	63	60				
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	16	28	10	25	33	19	7				
ELL	60	52	28	68	64	33	40				
ASN	90	74		97	86		92				
BLK	55	49	35	61	58	43	54				
HSP	60	57	27	70	63	43	55				
MUL	90	75		95	92						
WHT	77	67	40	83	74	50	86				
FRL	60	54	30	68	62	47	61				
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	18	29	29	13	34	32	29				
ELL	45	56	53	62	76	68	57				
ASN	94	77		97	96		100				
BLK	42	45	38	44	57	42	21				
HSP	53	56	54	61	60	46	61				
MUL	76	72		92	89						
WHT	79	61	50	83	69	45	82				
FRL	48	48	44	56	64	47	43				

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	72
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	78
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	80
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	89
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	49
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	71

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	86
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	84
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	64
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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile.

Learning gains for students in the lowest 25th percentile have slightly decreased for the past three years. Differentiation and small group instruction for lowest 25th percentile needs to be planned for and delivered with fidelity.

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

N/A. All Components saw an increase from 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.

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Differentiation and small group instruction for lowest 25th percentile needs to be planned for and delivered with fidelity.

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

Math Learning Gains increased from 71% in 2018 to 85% in 2019. Actions taken included math intervention groups, morning computer lab for lowest 25 percent in math to utilize iReady; leadership pulling small groups to work on math skills; school wide focus on standards based planning.

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

N/A

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

1. Student achievement will increase by teachers gaining a deeper understanding of the standards and clearly communicating to students-what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they will know they learned it.
2. Instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs of our diverse population.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Student achievement will increase by teachers gaining a deeper understanding of the standards and clearly communicating to students what they are learning, why they are learning it and how they will know that they learned it.

Research has shown that by shifting to standards-based planning, instruction will be rigorous and will allow teachers to better scaffold instruction to meet the needs of all students. Standards-based planning also ensures that teachers target what all students must be able to do in order to meet state expectations. In addition, teacher clarity is highly correlated to student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

The bottom 25% in ELA will increase from 42% to 50% and the learning gains in Math will increase from 67% to 68%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Professional Learning Communities will continue to delve into the standards in order to gain a deeper understanding and plan appropriately. In addition, PLCs will meet to unpack new curriculum (SIPPS, Achieve 3000 and LAFS) and discuss key questions: What do we want students to learn? Why are they learning the concept or skill? How will we know if students have learned it? What will we do if students have not learned it? What will we do if students have learned it?

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

PLCs with support from the leadership team will ensure alignment to standards-based planning and rigor of the appropriate standards.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule that allows grade levels to have PLC time together for collaborative planning
2. Schedule PLC Professional Development
- 3 PLC notes will be submitted to administration outlining the standards discussed and planning that occurred.
4. Leadership will collect walkthrough data on teacher clarity by asking students key questions: What are you learning about? Why are you learning this? How will you know you have learned it.

Person Responsible

Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Instruction will be differentiated to meet the needs of our diverse population (ELL, ESE, Gifted) in all academic areas.

As our student population and student needs change from year to year, we must be sure that we respond accordingly. We will adjust instruction and remain fluid and flexible to meet the needs of all learners.

Measurable Outcome:

All subgroups will show growth in all areas.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

In our PLCs, each grade level will discuss individual learners and how to ensure that we are meeting the academic, behavioral and emotional needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Our students will become more engaged in rigorous, academically-focused learning, positively impacting academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Create a schedule that allows grade levels teams to have PLC time together for planning and data sorts.
2. Each team leader will submit to administration PLC notes (form) outlining all topics discussed. Admin will review and provide necessary supports.
3. Provide opportunities for peers to collaborate on differentiated instruction in different subject areas.

Person Responsible

Delilah Rabeiro (delilah.rabeiro@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Creating a school environment that is safe and characterized by mutual respect allows for effective teaching and learning to take place. Clark Elementary provides constant monitoring of hallways, bathrooms, classrooms, and the playground areas by personnel before, during, and after school. Safety Teams, such as an Elopement Team, are established during pre-planning, and those specially-trained faculty and staff carry walkie talkie radios. Clark Expectations are posted in hallways and inside each classroom. The expectations are taught to the students, and are expected to be followed throughout the school. Students are rewarded for following the Clark Expectations with Cougar Cash and positive reinforcement. Special events and educational programs, such as "Wear Green Day" for positive mental health, and "Wear Blue for Bully Prevention" also helps to promote a safe and respectful learning environment. Most importantly, the teachers and faculty of Clark Elementary show students respect and encourage them to be successful by setting clear and concise classroom expectations, rewarding positive behavior, and helping students set both academic and behavior goals. Clark also offers a

HOST program, Monthly Guidance Lessons, Positive Behavior Support, and follows CHAMPs in the Cafeteria, Lunchroom, and other common areas. Teachers survey parents and students regarding each student's needs, likenesses, cultures, traditions, and additional relevant information. Teachers conference with students and parents to identify strengths, specific areas of need. Other programs and events include: Meet the Teacher; Kindergarten Parent Orientation, Student-Led Conferences; Fall Into Books; STEM Fair Showcase; Veteran's Day Assembly; Kindergarten Holiday Traditions; Multicultural Night and International Bazaar; PTA Family Nights at area restaurants; Student Planners (2nd - 8th); Communication Folders; and Great American Teach-In.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00