Hillsborough County Public Schools

King High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Gregory Basham   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 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

King High School

6815 N 56TH ST, Tampa, FL 33610

[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)
High School 9-12	No	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	86%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	B

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.

King High School will support all students' growth as critical thinkers, global citizens and informed decision makers.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to become a community which demonstrates the principals of P.R.I.D.E. (Positivity, Responsibilty, Integrity, Determination and Excellence)

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
Castelli, Arlene	Principal	Principal will oversee School Improvement Plan and hold school site stakeholders accountable.
Kight, Jessica	SAC Member	Calls and holds SAC Meetings. Creates agenda and communicates meeting agendas
Grieb, Lori Sue	Instructional Coach	Interprets and shares data with stakeholders. Works with departments on assessment data helping keep all informed of student progress
Finch, Christian	Assistant Principal	Insures teachers are giving out proper and timely assessments which will help measure student growth. Helps intervene and provide resources where needed.
Maddox, Samantha	Assistant Principal	Insures teachers are giving out proper and timely assessments which will help measure student growth. Helps intervene and provide resources where needed.
Stone-Geide, Bianca	Other	Student Success Coach. Monitors case load of at risk students and helps provide support where needed

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/1/2018, Gregory Basham

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.*

2

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

91

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: C (51%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	415	401	435	408	1659
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	205	179	183	148	715
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	5	2	16
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	0	0	0	0	140	122	0	0	262
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	119	0	0	246
	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	12	65	47	46	170

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/30/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434	474	451	424	1783
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	94	73	89	321
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	42	22	154
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	82	64	68	322
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	94	73	89	321

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	52	54	39	32	177

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	5	0	0	4	9
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434	474	451	424	1783
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	94	73	89	321
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	42	22	154
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108	82	64	68	322
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	94	73	89	321

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	52	54	39	32	177

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	5	0	0	4	9
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	48%	56%	56%	49%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	54%	51%	54%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	41%	42%	37%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	28%	49%	51%	41%	51%	49%
Math Learning Gains	33%	48%	48%	41%	47%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	45%	45%	42%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	55%	69%	68%	58%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	74%	75%	73%	78%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
09	2019	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	44%	53%	-9%	53%	-9%
	2018	50%	52%	-2%	53%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	66%	-14%	67%	-15%
2018	46%	62%	-16%	65%	-19%
Compare		6%			

CIVICS EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	73%	0%	70%	3%
2018	70%	70%	0%	68%	2%
Compare		3%			

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	12%	63%	-51%	61%	-49%
2018	23%	63%	-40%	62%	-39%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC						
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	57%	-23%	57%	-23%
2018	40%	56%	-16%	56%	-16%
Compare		-6%			

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	14	35	33	16	24	31	26	49		77	6
ELL	16	47	42	17	41	50	28	46		60	27
ASN	92	86		78	60		96	92		98	92
BLK	23	40	35	14	27	37	26	54		79	17

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
HSP	38	50	45	21	31	70	55	71		75	52
MUL	63	63		40	23		72	94		100	56
WHT	62	57	35	47	47		71	97		92	71
FRL	28	44	37	19	31	45	35	62		79	26

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	32	25	8	26	26	17	40		67	6
ELL	11	24	27	20	40	46	25	38		73	30
ASN	95	80		92	89		96	100		100	91
BLK	21	31	21	18	37	40	22	52		84	22
HSP	39	40	37	36	43	50	41	71		83	43
MUL	68	65		50	50		79	94		70	57
WHT	71	64	25	53	65		78	84		92	71
FRL	28	37	25	21	37	44	33	58		82	28

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	5	29	34	7	29	34	9	35		54	9
ELL	7	34	34	15	26	26	23	57		68	40
ASN	97	78		91	68	60	98	97		100	93
BLK	19	38	38	16	29	38	30	62		74	23
HSP	42	50	32	36	36	33	54	75		78	44
MUL	70	71		47	44		71	81		92	71
WHT	70	66	40	65	52	60	77	93		90	69
FRL	23	40	37	21	30	38	36	67		77	28

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	87
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	36
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	64
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	
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	64
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	42
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.

All Math Scores:
Lack of qualified teachers. We have had a lack of qualified teachers for the past 4/5 years. Extended periods of time covered by substitutes. Even with lesson plans - subs could not deliver instruction. Starting first nine weeks off with 2 subs

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

Algebra 1 EoC - Declined - 49% below state. Only 12% of test takers passed EoC
Lack of qualified teachers. Extended periods of time covered by substitutes. Even with
lesson plans - subs could not deliver instruction

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.

Algebra
Lack of qualified teachers. Extended periods of time covered by substitutes. Even with
lesson plans - subs could not deliver instruction

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

Biology EoC
Instructional Coaches and Department Head helped coach new teachers and teachers worked in
PLCs to deliver

common assessments. Common planning for lessons with data also helped improve
scores

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

1 - Attendance. We can't get students in front of us - or on ELearning.
2 - Technology Gap - need for more technology resources

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

1. Qualified and Highly Effective teachers for all core subjects
2. School wide Attendance must increase
3. Increase Math scores overall
4. Additional technology resources
5. Catch students up from multiple year learning gaps

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We need Highly Effective qualified teachers in front of our students that will be able to assist them in catching up from missed instruction from prior years. Students have suffered from multiple consecutive years of ineffective instruction primarily due to teacher vacancies. This has contributed to our low scores for at least the past 3 years. Our Black, ELL and SWD population has not shown progress in recent years.
Measurable Outcome:	Hire highly qualified teachers to complete our department - no vacancies. Student test scores will increase due to Highly Effective teachers providing quality instruction. Only 12% of our students taking the Algebra EoC passed and only 34% of our students taking Geometry EoC passed. We are going to increase our Algebra EoC pass rate to 55% and our Geometry EoC pass rate to 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Maddox (samantha.maddox@sdhc.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District will lift our hiring restrictions. We will hire quality instructors. Once instructors are hired - all will work in content specific PLCs to review test data and provide appropriate interventions. We will provide support for our students with what we have. (ELP and encourage Khan Academy) We will reach out to community members and any contact from surrounding colleges that will help tutor our students in math to help catch them up.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Tutoring via ELP and use of Khan Academy will help help our students increase their math skills.

Action Steps to Implement

- Provide ELP Tutoring
- Encourage Khan Academy participation
- Reach out to community and surrounding colleges to see if we can get help with our students.

Person Responsible	Arlene Castelli (arlene.castelli@hcps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our Average Daily Attendance rate is at 86.8% (whereas in years past - we have been in the 90% and above. Students are not in the building nor logging in to ELearning
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase our Attendance rate back up to at least 90%+
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Glorimar Leyton (glorimar.leyton@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will start an incentive program to encourage students to attend school. We will continue to work with ELearners with technology issues to increase Elearner attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Encouraging students to be part of the school will encourage positive attendance which will lead to higher graduation rates.

Action Steps to Implement

SSW and Success Coach will:

1 - work with Student Affairs and all administration to develop an incentive plan for student attendance.

2 - inform all stakeholders

3 - work with teachers to develop consistent attendance procedures.

Person Responsible Glorimar Leyton (glorimar.leyton@hcps.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to monitor all curricula via Department meetings and PLCs. All department assessments are reviewed by teachers and administrators.

Administration will monitor student discipline as well as teacher attendance

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.

We believe that communication and positive relationships with all stakeholders are the two key ingredients for creating and maintaining a positive culture. Our families need to know that their children are being served by teachers that are truly vested in insuring their success. We invite families to come on campus or to participate in any events we have in order for everyone to get a sense of the importance of being on our campus.

We communicate with our stakeholders on a consistent basis sending out information every week so families know what to expect. We have worked tirelessly on insuring we have the proper emails and phone numbers for our families so they stay connected. We realize that the less connected families are - the less connected our students want to be. It is our job to pull all stakeholders together with a common theme of all supporting our students.

We are connecting our students with Hillsborough Community College through a dual enrollment course for College and Career Readiness.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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