

Nassau County School District

# Wildlight Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Amber Nicholas Bovinette**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Wildlight Elementary

550 CURIOSITY AVE, Yulee, FL 32097

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">33%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">26%</p>

## School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	A	A	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Nassau 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.

The mission of Wildlight Elementary School is to embrace diversity and create a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners who will reach their maximum potential academically, socially and developmentally in a safe and nurturing learning environment.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Wildlight Elementary is to allow all students to reach their maximum potential in all aspects of life by providing a safe learning environment, embracing diversity and creating a community of risk-taking, self-motivated learners.

### 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
Nicholas-Bovinetto, Amber	Principal	
Druelle, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Chair
Jones, Whitney	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Chair
Ray, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Sides, Donna	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Chair
Martin, Kelley	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade Chair
Bozeman, Jennifer	Instructional Media	
Parks, Emily	School Counselor	ESE Grade Level Chair, Guidance Counselor
Carr, Brooke	School Counselor	
Faucher, Natalie	Instructional Coach	
Sellers, Krystal	Teacher, K-12	
Greeson, Kristan	Teacher, K-12	
Pomeroy, Kaitlin	Teacher, ESE	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Amber Nicholas Bovinette

**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.*

35

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

54

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	



<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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	111	133	112	122	124	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	730
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	8	8	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	12	11	7	1	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	7	5	4	5	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
	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	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	6	3	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/16/2020

#### 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	130	108	127	127	130	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	16	6	11	1	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	4	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	130	108	127	127	130	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	16	6	11	1	13	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
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	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

**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	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	4	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	74%	76%	57%	0%	73%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	63%	65%	58%	0%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	0%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	82%	85%	63%	0%	82%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	77%	62%	0%	71%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	67%	51%	0%	64%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	75%	53%	0%	73%	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	77%	75%	2%	58%	19%
	2018	83%	76%	7%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	68%	4%	58%	14%
	2018	67%	69%	-2%	56%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	67%	75%	-8%	56%	11%
	2018	65%	71%	-6%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	83%	-1%	62%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	80%	-4%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	81%	-1%	64%	16%
	2018	79%	83%	-4%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	82%	86%	-4%	60%	22%
	2018	73%	79%	-6%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	73%	3%	53%	23%
	2018	65%	72%	-7%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
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	67	62	62	65	66	61	62				
BLK	68	68		68	59		73				
HSP	53			65							
MUL	50	40		75	80						
WHT	78	67	64	86	78	61	80				
FRL	65	57	45	73	75	53	61				

  

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	57	38	33	56	49	53	56				
BLK	64	60		62	48		50				
HSP	50	53		67	67		64				
MUL	84			68							
WHT	74	53	36	79	69	72	73				
FRL	62	50	27	68	53	54	56				

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

**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	69
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	64
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
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	59
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	61
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	73
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.**

The lowest component for WES is gains for the lowest 25th percentile in ELA at 54%. The gains for the lowest 25th percentile in Math was 56%. In subgroups, the ELA learning gains for students classified as MULT was 40%. The school opened in the 2017-2018 school year, and gains were

calculated for the 2018-19 school year, and students did not test in the 2019-2020 school year, so there is not enough information to determine trends, although it is important to note that from the 17-18 school year to the 18-19 school year, the percentage increase of lowest 25th percentile in ELA increased from 33% to 54%, an increase of 21 percent.

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

The greatest decline occurred with the 4th grade cohort in ELA. The cohort dropped 11 percentage points from 3rd to 4th grade.

**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.**

WES scored above the state average on every component of the state grading system. However, the school was closest to the state average in ELA learning gains of the lowest 25%. WES's learning gains in this area was 54%, and the state average was 48%.

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

WES's most improved element was the lowest quartile learning gains in ELA. This area improved by 21 percent, from 33% to 54%.

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

WES's multiracial student subgroup dropped from 84% proficiency in ELA to 50% proficiency. A contributing factor is the increase in the number of students in this subgroup. Many came from out of state and were not exposed to Florida curriculum and standards in previous years.

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

1. Increasing learning gains in the Lowest Quartile Reading gains.
2. Increasing learning gains in ELA overall.
3. Increasing cohort achievement
4. Increasing learning gains in the Lowest Quartile Math gains.
5. Improving the percentage of students in WES's multiracial subgroup scoring in the proficient range.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Fifty-four percent of our lowest quartile students made learning gains in the Spring of 2019. This is only 1% above the state average.

**Measurable Outcome:** WES will have a 5-7% improvement in learning gains in ELA on the Florida Standards Assessment during the spring of 2021, as calculated by the state.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** WES is implementing intentional and rigorous differentiated ELA instruction based on data from diagnostic assessments and progress monitoring to achieve student growth.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Assessments and monitoring through iReady, STAR, Lexia, and Progress Monitoring demonstrate a need to continue adjustments to achieve growth in ELA.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Differentiated small group instruction
2. Targeted in school intervention
3. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS
4. In-School and After School Tutoring
5. Collaborative planning and professional development

**Person Responsible** Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)



## #2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the 2019 attendance data, 7% of students did not maintain a 90% attendance rate.

**Measurable Outcome:** At the end of the 20-21 school year, the goal of WES is to decrease the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year by 2%. Our goal is for 95% of students to maintain 90% attendance rate.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** \*Check-in/Check-out  
 \*Parent conferences  
 \*Attendance reports  
 \*Increase parent awareness of attendance policy and school-wide reinforcers for students, classes, and school

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Attendance data was derived from the Early Warning System. Research shows that student attendance is the single most important factor in student success. If we can increase attendance at school, we can impact student achievement and performance.

### Action Steps to Implement

\*Check-in/Check-out  
 \*Parent conferences  
 \*Attendance reports  
 \*Increase parent awareness of attendance policy and school-wide reinforcers for students, classes, and school

**Person Responsible** Amber Nicholas-Bovinette (nicholasbovinetteam@nassau.k12.fl.us)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**We will use the same strategies to address the additional priorities as increase reading ability will improve all aspects of reading and math achievement.**

## 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.

WES builds positive relationships with families by establishing and supporting the PTO, SAC, and hosting parent nights in Reading, Math, Science, and Technology. Parents have access to the FOCUS student data base and receive mid-nine week progress reports in addition to quarterly report cards. In addition to weekly and monthly newsletters, the REMIND app, the school Facebook Page and Blackboard Parent call system is used to communicate school-wide events and information.

**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.	<b>Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
2	III.A.	<b>Areas of Focus: Culture &amp; Environment: Student Attendance</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>