

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Maniscalco K 8 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	16
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Maniscalco K 8 School

939 DEBUEL RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Reale

Start Date for this Principal: 6/24/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	83%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	19

Maniscalco K 8 School

939 DEBUEL RD, Lutz, FL 33549

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	61%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

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

Maniscalco will provide a nurturing and safe learning environment to develop lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Maniscalco will rank in the top 10% of Hillsborough Elementary and Middle Schools.

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
Reale, Tammy	Principal	
Phillips, Joshua	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/24/2020, Tammy Reale

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

65

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
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)	83%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: B (61%)
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	66	76	90	76	80	91	37	25	38	0	0	0	0	579	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	11	11	8	6	12	12	11	10	0	0	0	0	86	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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	6	21	9	11	4	0	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	15	6	0	0	0	0	44	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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	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	

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	11	11	10	4	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	13	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	1	1	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	11	11	10	4	7	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	13	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	1	1	2	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	60%	57%	61%	67%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	59%	73%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	54%	65%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	65%	55%	62%	69%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains	62%	57%	59%	73%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	49%	52%	64%	54%	50%
Science Achievement	54%	50%	56%	77%	54%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	77%	78%	0%	78%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	53%	53%	0%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
	2018	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
	2018	64%	51%	13%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	61%	53%	8%	54%	7%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	63%	54%	9%	62%	1%
	2018	67%	55%	12%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	57%	15%	64%	8%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	55%	54%	1%	60%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	54%	12%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	61%	49%	12%	55%	6%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	51%	5%	53%	3%
	2018	71%	52%	19%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	25	40	43	33	61	63	11				
ELL	46	72	92	59	81	83					
ASN	75			83							
BLK	42	67		46	57						
HSP	58	64	62	60	64	60	53				
MUL	60			67							
WHT	64	65	68	71	62	62	55				
FRL	58	63	65	59	61	60	52				
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	13	28	28	33	40	40	10				
ELL	48	63		64	56						
BLK	44	71		46	57						
HSP	55	50	45	67	56	50	61				
WHT	62	60	50	72	64	43	75				
FRL	54	59	52	65	59	45	59				
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	12	54	58	32	59	58	38				
ELL	39	61		54	56		50				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	53	58		56	75						
HSP	66	71	63	69	73	69	72				
MUL	64			82							
WHT	70	78	65	69	72	65	75				
FRL	59	68	61	61	74	66	69				

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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	492
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	71
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	79
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	53
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	60
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 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	61
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.

Third Grade ELA showed the lowest performance at 51%. Students had large gaps in phonics, fluency, and comprehension.

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

Fifth Grade Math showed the greatest decline of 11%. Lack of foundational skills and multiplication fact fluency. Fifth Grade Science had a decline of 15% due to lack of retention of previous years standards.

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.

Third Grade ELA is down 7% from the State which has the greatest gap compared to the state average. Students had large gaps in phonics, fluency, and comprehension.

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

Fourth Grade ELA showed the most improvement up 4%. Increase in differentiation of writing strategies.

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

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities is at 39%. Two main concerns are phonics deficits and foundational math skills.

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

1. Student With Disabilities Federal Index
2. 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency
3. Bottom Quartile for ELA and Math
4. 5th Grade Science
5. Civics EOC, Algebra EOC, High School Courses

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Student achievement will increase when there is school wide focus on differentiated instruction to ensure learning gains for all students. We have seen an overall decrease in reading proficiency on FSA Reading and i-Ready. Our bottom quartile has declined in reading over the past two years. Students with Disabilities fell below the Federal Index of 41%. 80% of Students with Disabilities scored a level 1 or 2 on FSA Reading. 69% of Students with Disabilities scored a level 1 or 2 on FSA Math. 93% of Students with Disabilities scored a level 1 or 2 on FSA Science. 40% of students not proficient in Reading. 35 % of students not proficient in Math. 46% of students not proficient in Science. 38% of students not making learning gains in Reading. 38% of students not making learning gains in Math.

Measurable Outcome:

We need to increase our Federal Index for the Subgroup- Students with Disabilities from 39% to 42%. Increase the proficiency of Students with Disabilities from 20% to 35% in Reading, 31% to 45% in Math, and 7% to 25% in Science. Increase overall proficiency from 60% to 65% in Reading, 65% to 70% in Math, and 54% to 60% in Science. Increase learning gains from 62% to 68% in Reading and 62% to 68% in Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group instruction, standard based objectives, standards based lesson plans and instruction, monthly PLCs, collaborative data conversations, AVID strategies, professional development, differentiation, ILT, MTSS, School wide behavior plan, culture literacy, parent and student curriculum involvement, administrative feedback to instruction staff, technology for instruction, and resources for instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

School wide systems that develop teachers and increase student engagement and learning gains for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly PLCs with log and sign-in sheet with support from academic coaches

Person Responsible

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Grade Level MTSS bi-monthly agenda and sign-in sheet with support from school psychologist and academic coaches

Person Responsible

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Professional Development monthly with sign-in sheet with coaching from academic coaches

Person Responsible

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Job embedded PD from academic coaches

Person Responsible

Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Student Goal Conferencing with support from academic coaches

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Small group instruction with support and modeling by academic coaches

Person Responsible Tammy Reale (tammy.reale@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

School Leadership will be holding PLC/MTSS meetings every Monday with grade level teachers and VE Teachers. Middle School will also participate in monthly meeting to focus on the needs of students not making adequate progress in specific subject areas. The focus of these meetings will be on our bottom quartile students, VE Students and students not making adequate gains. We will look at what strategies are being utilized and what changes need to be made in order for students to be successful. Teachers will be utilizing Brainspring, i-Ready, SIPPS, and Brightfish Reading to support students with deficiencies in phonics and gaps in foundational skills for both Reading and Math. Teams will also be planning with coaches, utilizing district instructional guides, and focusing on standards based small groups. We will also be discussing attendance and behavior concerns that are affecting student performance.

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 have taken the results from the ASQi Survey this year and created a Climate and Culture Committee. We made a more detailed survey for the staff to complete and then took that data and disaggregated it to make a plan for the 2020-2021 School Year. We will be making some changes to Teacher Leadership which will include creating a Steering Committee. A new school wide behavior plan will be implemented, that will be created by teachers in grades K-8. Changes will be made to the structure of Professional Development to meet the needs of a K-8 school. We will also have Literacy Night, Math/Science Night, Local Business and Restaurant Partnerships, Spirit Nights involving the local community, School Wide and PTSA Newsletter, weekly Parent Links, Midterm Progress Reports, Volunteers working with students, School Website, NEJHS, NJHS, and Student Council active in the community. Administration will collaborate with with student council on new initiatives 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.

Part V: Budget

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

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