Hillsborough County Public Schools

Fishhawk Creek 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	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fishhawk Creek Elementary School

16815 DORMAN RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Steven Sims

Start Date for this Principal: 5/27/2020

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)	18%
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 (69%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info	ormation*
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	0

Fishhawk Creek Elementary School

16815 DORMAN RD, Lithia, FL 33547

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Gi (per MSID		2019-20 Title I School	l Disadvant	Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3)
Elementary S PK-5	School	No		17%
Primary Servio (per MSID I	• •	Charter School	(Reporte	Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2)
K-12 General E	ducation	No		33%
School Grades Histo	ory			
Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	Α	А	Α	Α

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.

FishHawk Creek will provide all Falcons with a rigorous education enabling them to think critically and become responsible, caring citizens who soar to their academic best.

Provide the school's vision statement.

FishHawk Creek Elementary will soar to the highest level of academic achievement and citizenship.

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
Sims, Steve	Principal	
Zulkoski, Amanda	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/27/2020, Steven Sims

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.

3

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.

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

73

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)	18%
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
	2018-19: A (71%)
	2017-18: A (69%)
School Grades History	2016-17: A (71%)
	2015-16: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Int	formation*
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	<u>Lucinda Thompson</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code	e. For more information, <u>click here</u> .

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	
Number of students enrolled	118	159	158	179	168	182	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	964	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	3	11	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	
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	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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
Indicator		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOtal
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
Indicator		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

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).

Sahaal Crada Campanant		2019		2018				
School Grade Component	School	District	State	School	District	State		
ELA Achievement	79%	52%	57%	82%	52%	55%		
ELA Learning Gains	63%	55%	58%	67%	55%	57%		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	50%	53%	57%	51%	52%		
Math Achievement	83%	54%	63%	82%	53%	61%		
Math Learning Gains	74%	57%	62%	70%	54%	61%		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	46%	51%	55%	46%	51%		
Science Achievement	79%	50%	53%	83%	48%	51%		

	EWS Indi	cators as	Input Ea	rlier in th	e Survey		
Indicator		Total					
Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	(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	83%	52%	31%	58%	25%
	2018	84%	53%	31%	57%	27%
Same Grade C	omparison	-1%				
Cohort Com	Cohort Comparison					
04	2019	73%	55%	18%	58%	15%
	2018	81%	55%	26%	56%	25%
Same Grade C	omparison	-8%				
Cohort Com	parison	-11%				
05	2019	81%	54%	27%	56%	25%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	55%	15%
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison				•	
Cohort Com	parison	0%				

	MATH										
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison					
03	2019	80%	54%	26%	62%	18%					
	2018	82%	55%	27%	62%	20%					
Same Grade C	omparison	-2%									
Cohort Com	Cohort Comparison										
04	2019	87%	57%	30%	64%	23%					
	2018	91%	57%	34%	62%	29%					
Same Grade C	omparison	-4%									
Cohort Com	parison	5%									
05	2019	82%	54%	28%	60%	22%					
	2018	73%	54%	19%	61%	12%					
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison										
Cohort Com	Cohort Comparison										

SCIENCE												
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison						
05	2019	78%	51%	27%	53%	25%						

SCIENCE											
Grade	Year	School	District	School- District Comparison	State	School- State Comparison					
	2018	77%	52%	25%	55%	22%					
Same Grade C	Same Grade Comparison										
Cohort Com	parison										

Subgroup Data

	2019	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	PONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
41	42	42	51	58	54	30				
68	55	40	69	80	67					
89	73		96	93						
63	47		67	71						
76	63	46	77	67	60	73				
83	69		89	73		79				
79	63	61	84	74	62	81				
69	52	57	66	72	52	70				
	2018	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMP	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS	•	
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
46	55	43	49	53	36	47				
58	50	45	63	63						
90	50		100	75						
57	47		70	75		55				
78	63	55	73	57	50	63				
75	52	45	85	72		71				
80	59	47	84	76	71	82				
71	53	48	77	73	68	68				
	2017	SCHO	OL GRAD	E COMF	ONENT	S BY SI	JBGRO	UPS		
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
52	57	46	53	66	58	59				
67	55		67	73						
89	77		95	77						
81	86		73	64		70				
75	57	44	75	60	53	68				
85	56		85	61						
83	68	59	82	73	59	86				
69	62	54	64	60	41	64				
	41 68 89 63 76 83 79 69 ELA Ach. 46 58 90 57 78 75 80 71 ELA Ach. 52 67 89 81 75 85 83	ELA ELA Ach. LG 41 42 68 55 89 73 63 47 76 63 83 69 79 63 69 52 2018 ELA Ach. LG 46 55 58 50 90 50 57 47 78 63 75 52 80 59 71 53 2017 ELA ELA Ach. LG 52 57 67 55 89 77 81 86 75 57 85 56 83 68	ELA Ach. ELA LG L25% 41 42 42 68 55 40 89 73 63 63 47 76 63 46 83 69 79 63 61 69 52 57 2018 SCHOO ELA Ach. ELA LG LG LS% 45 60 25% 45 60 25% 45 90 50 50 57 47 78 63 55 75 52 45 80 59 47 71 53 48 2017 SCHOO ELA LG LG L25% 56 67 55 89 77 81 86 75 57 44 85 56 88 59 80 59 77 81 86 75 57 44 48 55 67 55 89 77 81 86 75 57 44 85 56 83	ELA Ach. ELA LG LG L25% Math Ach. 41 42 42 51 68 55 40 69 89 73 96 63 47 67 76 63 46 77 83 69 89 79 63 61 84 69 52 57 66 Z018 SCHOOL GRAD ELA LG LG LG Math Ach. Ach. 46 55 43 49 58 50 45 63 90 50 100 57 747 70 78 63 55 73 75 52 45 85 80 59 47 84 71 53 48 77 Z017 SCHOOL GRAD ELA LG LG LG Math Ach. Ach. 52 57 46 53 67 55	ELA Ach. ELA LG LG L25% Math Ach. Math LG LG 41 42 42 51 58 68 55 40 69 80 89 73 96 93 63 47 67 71 76 63 46 77 67 83 69 89 73 79 63 61 84 74 69 52 57 66 72 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMF ELA Ach. LG LG Math Ach. LG 46 55 43 49 53 58 50 45 63 63 90 50 100 75 75 52 45 85 72 80 59 47 84 76 71 53 48 77 73 2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMF ELA LG LG LG Math Ach. <td>ELA Ach. ELA LG LG L25% Math Ach. Math LG L25% Math LG L25%</td> <td>ELA Ach. ELA LG LG L25% Math Ach. Math LG L25% Math LG L25% Sci Ach. 41 42 42 51 58 54 30 68 55 40 69 80 67 67 89 73 96 93 73 79 67 60 73 79 76 63 46 77 67 60 73 79 79 79 63 61 84 74 62 81 79</td> <td>ELA Ach. ELA LG L25% Math LG L25% Math LG L25% Math LG L25% Sci Ach. Sci Ac</td> <td> Ach. LG LG L25% Ach. LG L25% Ach. Ach. Ach. LG L25% Ach. Ach. Ach. Accel. </td> <td> Color</td>	ELA Ach. ELA LG LG L25% Math Ach. Math LG L25% Math LG L25%	ELA Ach. ELA LG LG L25% Math Ach. Math LG L25% Math LG L25% Sci Ach. 41 42 42 51 58 54 30 68 55 40 69 80 67 67 89 73 96 93 73 79 67 60 73 79 76 63 46 77 67 60 73 79 79 79 63 61 84 74 62 81 79	ELA Ach. ELA LG L25% Math LG L25% Math LG L25% Math LG L25% Sci Ach. Sci Ac	Ach. LG LG L25% Ach. LG L25% Ach. Ach. Ach. LG L25% Ach. Ach. Ach. Accel.	Color

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	70
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	562
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	63
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	88
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	62
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	67

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	79
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	72
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	63
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.

The lowest subgroup data we have is SWD score of 41 % down from 46% in 2018.

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

4th grade ELA showed the biggest drop in scores from previous years dats. The biggest contributing factor for this is the introduction of writing into the test.

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.

na

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

Math score are continuing to rise across 3rd 4th and 5th grade.

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

Writing scores must increase across all grade levels

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

- Increasing writing gap
- 2. Increasing Math score across grade levels
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Reviewing FSA math data from 2018-2019 students percentage scoring proficiency stayed at 83%, therefore we wish to increase this score.

Measurable Outcome:

The 2020-2021 goal would be to increase this score to 85% on the FSA

mathematics assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Steve Sims (steven.sims@hcps.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Using formative data to create differentiated instruction within each small

group.

Rationale for Evidence-

Small group has been proven effective to meet the specific needs of all

based Strategy:

students.

Action Steps to Implement

Bi-Monthly PLC Meetings- Steven Sims & Team Leaders

Monthly Data Chats- Grade Levels/Team Leaders

Professional Development- Math Contact & Administration

Person Responsible Steve Sims (steven.sims@hcps.net)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Student achievement will increase by 2% in math FSA scores as teachers provide data driven small group instruction aligned with the standards.

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 PTA is very active in the school. The PTA is a great vehicle for Fishhawk to use, they help to get all subgroups of parents involved in the day to day activities of our school. Our goal is to get as many parents as we can involved through activities such as awards ceremonies, homeroom parents, fundraisers and volunteers. It is vital for the success of all students to have the parents involved in as many things as possible throughout the school year.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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