

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Mckitrick 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	18
Budget to Support Goals	19

Mckitrick Elementary School

5503 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Allison Cline

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

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)	13%
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 (78%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (71%)
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	19

Mckitrick Elementary School

5503 W LUTZ LAKE FERN RD, Lutz, FL 33558

[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	14%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

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.

We believe in nurturing talent, imagination, and life-long learning. We believe in teachers that engage with innovation and effectiveness. We believe in a balance between independence and collaboration. We believe in educating for the future. We believe in children.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students will be provided equitable experiences which build their foundation for intellectual and social growth. Our mission is to develop a positive learning community where everyone succeeds.

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
Cline, Allison	Principal	
Manrique, Debbie	SAC Member	SAC Chair - coordinate SAC meetings. Work to develop the School-wide Improvement Plan. Recruit SAC Parent Membership. Coordinate A+ Vote.
	Assistant Principal	School-wide Instructional Leadership/ SAC Co-chair/

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Allison Cline

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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)	13%
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 (78%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (71%)
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	130	135	165	177	206	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	981
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	3	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	89%	52%	57%	83%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	78%	55%	58%	66%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	50%	53%	58%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	54%	63%	82%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	57%	62%	66%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	46%	51%	52%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	50%	53%	72%	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	88%	52%	36%	58%	30%
	2018	84%	53%	31%	57%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	88%	55%	33%	58%	30%
	2018	86%	55%	31%	56%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	89%	54%	35%	56%	33%
	2018	80%	51%	29%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	54%	32%	62%	24%
	2018	80%	55%	25%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	57%	28%	64%	21%
	2018	88%	57%	31%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	85%	54%	31%	60%	25%
	2018	85%	54%	31%	61%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	51%	28%	53%	26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	79%	52%	27%	55%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	46	59	50	46	60	52	42				
ELL	71	82		79	82						
ASN	98	89		95	89		87				
BLK	90	76		70	76						
HSP	83	80	58	81	80	59	77				
MUL	84	56		84	78						
WHT	89	77	74	86	81	60	81				
FRL	79	76	81	77	82	78	79				
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	41	46	25	54	54	46	70				
ELL	63			63							
ASN	92	75		94	86		80				
BLK	62	39		73	44						
HSP	82	63	44	76	59	59	79				
MUL	82	68		79	77		80				
WHT	84	65	48	87	71	63	80				
FRL	66	47	17	71	59	55	68				
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	53	63	50	53	48	27	56				
ELL	54			69							
ASN	97	87		97	78						
BLK	65	50		85	75						
HSP	74	60	46	73	65	44	48				
MUL	81	81		81	67						
WHT	84	65	60	82	64	52	75				
FRL	68	68	61	70	63	56	59				

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	78
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	80
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	623
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	79
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	92
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	78
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	74

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	76
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	78
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	79
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.

Learning gains for math bottom quartile students fell 1%, from 61% (2018) to 60% (2019).

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

Learning gains for math bottom quartile students -1%. A more significant focus was placed on increasing student achievement in reading by PLC's.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

N/A

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

Learning gains for ELA bottom quartile students increased by 27%. ELA bottom quartile students were our school wide focus. Research based instructional strategies were used with fidelity during guided reading and MTSS/Rti, to increase student fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. In addition, Tier 1 focus was on differentiation, using common data to identify areas of need within subgroups and across achievement levels by PLCs, to determine appropriate strategies to meet the needs of students within core curriculum.

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

In 2018-2019 school year, 52 students had attendance below 90%. Currently awaiting updated data for 2019-2020 school year.

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

1. Increase learning gains for math bottom quartile students.
2. Increase math achievement for students with disabilities.
3. Increase achievement for science.
4. Increase science achievement for students with disabilities.
5. Promote a culture of equity through the use of positive behavioral strategies, MTSS supports and SEL practices.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 81% of students achieved their expected annual learning gain, while only 60% of bottom quartile students, and 46% of students with disabilities achieved their annual learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: At least 65% of bottom quartile math students, and 55% of students with disabilities will achieve their expected annual learning gains on the FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We are going to increase student achievement by differentiating instruction using Blended Learning, Innovative Technology, and Achievement Level Descriptors to engage all students in significant learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Blended Learning allows for increased differentiation, engagement, and student accountability. Through daily small group instruction and the use of individualized, adaptive technology, teachers are better able to engage students in significant learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze 18-19 FSA math data and 19-20 Form 2 math data to determine trends and opportunities for growth across all achievement levels and subgroups.
2. Teacher lead PD/Review of best practices and expectations for Blended Learning and grade level achievement descriptors during pre-planning.
3. Utilize the district's BYOD program to increase access to technology for all students as needed.
4. Teacher lead PD of technology tools and practices that provide opportunities to increase differentiation and student engagement.
5. Create an innovation committee to provide on-going professional development and support for teachers in the use of technology and STEAM based practices to differentiate instruction and engage students in significant learning in all content areas.

Person Responsible Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: 79% of students have achieved proficiency in science for the past two consecutive years.

Measurable Outcome: At least 82% of students will score a level 3 or higher on FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will increase the amount of science based texts students are exposed to during guided reading, applying cross content strategies, such as Close Reading, Reciprocal Teaching, and Note and Notice for Non-Fiction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using these strategies in guided reading the previous year, student achievement in reading increased by 6%. Applying these strategies with an increased emphasis on science based non-fiction text during guided reading, will increase student's comprehension, academic vocabulary, and build background knowledge; resulting in an overall increase in student achievement in science.

Action Steps to Implement

1. An increased emphasis on using science based non-fiction texts during guided reading.
2. Intentional focus on academic science vocabulary to build background knowledge.
3. Explicit science instruction including hands on experiences.
4. Promote the application of STEAM concepts in every day activities to enhance creativity, confidence, problem solving and collaboration skills.

Person Responsible: Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to Covid related school closures in the 2020 school year, and the uncertainty of how learning will look for the 20-21 school year, the mental health and well-being of our students and staff will be our number one priority.

Measurable Outcome: The 2021 HCPS ASQ Survey will reflect at least 95% or higher Overall Satisfaction with the positive behavior interventions and supports put in place to build and maintain strong relationships with all stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Allison Cline (allison.cline@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: PBIS, MTSS Supports, SEL and Restorative Practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The use of these research-based practices will provide effective and equitable ways to meet the social and emotional needs of all students and strengthen relationships between all stakeholders during this time of uncertainty.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Discuss social and emotional challenges faced by teachers and students during e-learning and areas of opportunity to build and maintain both site-based and on-line relationships for the 20/21 school year.
2. Provide professional development and review of current school-wide PBIS, MTSS Supports, SEL and Restorative Practices.
3. Create a culture and climate committee to provide opportunities for teachers to identify areas of need and develop equitable, school-wide incentives and supports to effectively meet the diverse social, emotional, and behavioral needs of all students; providing on-going professional development and support for teachers throughout the year.
4. Establish clear expectations for additional site-based and on-line school-wide PBIS Programs: Golden Bobcats, SEL Room, and the Cultural Arts Incentive Program.

Person Responsible Allison Cline (allison.cline@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.

- * Open House/Meet and Greet
- * New Family Meet and Greet Night
- * Curriculum Nights
- * Math Night
- * Literacy night
- * Health/Safety Fair
- * Kindergarten Art Display
- * Grandparents Breakfast
- * Spring Festival
- * All-Pro Dads Monthly Meetings
- * Conference Nights/ Bi-annual
- * PTA Family Fun Nights/Monthly
- * Monthly Character Award Assemblies
- * 4th/5th Annual NJHS Induction Night
- * Fall/Spring Clubs
- * Key Club
- * PTA Volunteer/Tutor Training
- * Student Mentor Program
- * Student Council

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00