

Nassau County School District

Fernandina Beach High 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	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Fernandina Beach High School

435 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Chris Webber

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
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: A (71%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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.

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	18

Fernandina Beach High School

435 CITRONA DR, Fernandina Beach, FL 32034

[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	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

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 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.

Fernandina Beach High School's mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fernandina Beach High School will provide a safe and productive learning environment in which students can communicate effectively, think critically, solve problems and are technologically literate through a variety of curricular and extra-curricular activities. Through a challenging course of study with high standards, students will become responsible learners who can not only work collaboratively, but also be accountable for their own academic and developmental progress.

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
Webber, Chris	Principal	Principal
Coombs, Sarah	School Counselor	
Hicks, Robert	School Counselor	
Romack, Carol	Teacher, K-12	
Snyder, Valerie	Teacher, K-12	
Talbert, Shane	Teacher, K-12	
Rathmann, Steven	Teacher, K-12	
Avila, Janel	Teacher, ESE	
Glackin, James	Teacher, K-12	
Monaghan, Joseph	Teacher, K-12	
Schreiber, James	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Chris Webber

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

64

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
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: A (71%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: A (66%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	236	255	211	246	955	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	49	36	56	175	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	1	0	13	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	9	10	38	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	8	6	29	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	14	12	16	70	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	11	15	59	

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	

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	268	230	248	203	954	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	27	39	123	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	8	10	40	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	34	25	17	85	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	32	37	23	118	

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	14	22	19	23	78

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5

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	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	268	230	248	203	954
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	29	27	39	123
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	8	10	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	34	25	17	85
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	32	37	23	118

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	14	22	19	23	78

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	1	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5

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	71%	65%	56%	70%	62%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	55%	51%	58%	54%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	38%	42%	42%	41%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	71%	64%	51%	64%	54%	49%
Math Learning Gains	56%	54%	48%	46%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	52%	45%	32%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	93%	84%	68%	74%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	80%	73%	79%	80%	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	72%	65%	7%	55%	17%
	2018	74%	66%	8%	53%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	67%	64%	3%	53%	14%
	2018	59%	64%	-5%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

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	91%	84%	7%	67%	24%
2018	76%	80%	-4%	65%	11%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		15%			
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	79%	82%	-3%	70%	9%
2018	79%	81%	-2%	68%	11%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	74%	-14%	61%	-1%
2018	61%	77%	-16%	62%	-1%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	68%	9%	57%	20%
2018	68%	59%	9%	56%	12%
Compare		9%			

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	48	38	42	64		100	96		95	33
ELL											
BLK	42	44	20	61	64	80	80	65		69	55
HSP	53	47	44	52	47			63		71	58
MUL	66	70		55	62		100			91	70
WHT	78	65	53	77	56	59	92	88		94	80
FRL	58	57	38	53	49	62	85	67		79	65
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	58	69	63	70	58		70			75	22

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
ELL	27	50	46	23			20				
BLK	40	68	67	53	42		45	70		79	58
HSP	49	56	45	52	64		56			86	68
MUL	67	43		50	55		70			71	90
WHT	77	62	58	72	53	49	86	85		91	70
FRL	49	61	63	54	51	42	62	77		77	52
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	48	52	42	48	44		50	70		82	29
ELL	10	21	25	18							
BLK	39	51	40	38	43	45	47	47		100	71
HSP	46	39	38	50	35		50	64		90	83
MUL	50	29		53	47						
WHT	77	63	48	67	46	30	78	83		97	77
FRL	49	46	38	46	40	30	58	68		98	65

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	67
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	35
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	741
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
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	35

English Language Learners	
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	
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	58
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	53
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	73
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	74
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	59
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA Lowest 25 percentage students.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year was the ELA Lowest 25 percent students. The contributing factors were a lack of students understanding in the "key ideas and details" strand of the FSA ELA assessment.

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.

We did not have any large deficiency gaps when compared to the state average. Our lowest component was tied with the state average at 42%. On a positive note, the largest positive gap was in our math lowest 25th percentile as we were 20% higher than the state average and a 19% improvement from last years scores.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was in our math lowest 25th percentile as we were 20% higher than the state average and a 19% improvement from last years scores. Some of the actions were that we provided more support facilitation in these classes, we offered more tutoring times, and we assigned some of our veteran teachers to these classes.

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

Two potential areas of concerns learning gains of our lower 25% on the ELA FSA assessment and the progress of English Language Learners in achieving English language proficiency.

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

1. Improve the learning gains in our ELA Lowest 25 percentile
2. Improve our ELL in achieving English Language proficiency
3. Reduce the amount of Level 1 Level 2 on Statewide assessments
4. Improve our attendance below 90%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	We dropped from 58% to 42% on our ELA learning gains of our lowest 25 percentile.
Description and Rationale:	We need to refocus on our instructional strategies, adapt to different learning styles, and provide additional support for these students.
Measurable Outcome:	Some measurable outcomes are benchmark assessments to evaluate where each student is. Provide extra instruction in each strand deficiency. Include strategies to summarize, analyze, and contextualize complex informational text.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Webber (chris.webber@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark assessments, close reads, sample writings, determine lexile levels
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Benchmark assessments can help determine individual student learning gains. These allow for more specific instruction on deficient areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Determine lexile levels and reading comprehension
2. Determine writing deficiencies based upon sample writing prompts.
3. Start planning lessons and activities periodically based upon the standards and these deficiencies
4. After certain timelines, give benchmark assessment on previous taught standards
5. Plan future lessons on the upcoming standards with an emphasis on the deficiencies from benchmarks.

Person Responsible Chris Webber (chris.webber@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Progress of English language learners in achieving english language proficiency was below 41%.
Measurable Outcome:	Improvement in lexile levels, improvement in proficiency based upon the FSA ELA assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chris Webber (chris.webber@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ESOL class, USA Test Prep
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Using USA test prep with a translatable platform, we hope to increase the students proficiency level. By using this platform as another tool, we are able to conduct periodic level set tests where we can measure any improvements.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assign all ELL students to an ESOL class
2. Assign all ELL students in the USA Test Prep platform
3. Perform first level/lexile test
4. Base future instruction/classes on these test results
5. Continue instruction and hold periodic benchmark/level set tests.

Person Responsible Chris Webber (chris.webber@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.

For our other areas of focus, school leadership will work closely with the ELA and ELA intensive reading and language teachers to ensure they have the resources available to assist the students in the preparation for the FSA ELA test. Leadership will coordinate collaborative planning for the teachers to allow for more in depth planning and data analysis.

School leadership will also assist in monitoring excessive absences from each grade level. Communication to the parents, guardians and students will be more consistent.

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.

School staff, faculty, and administrators strive to strengthen family involvement and family empowerment in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies with School Improvement, Strategic Planning, Title I, Title II, Title IV, Title VI, Community Involvement Programs, Business Partnerships, and other community involvement activities.

The school will provide the coordination, technical assistance, and other support necessary to assist in planning and implementing effective and comprehensive parent involvement programs, based on the National Standards for Parent/Family Involvement Programs, which include:

- A. Communication between home and school is regular, two-way and meaningful.
- B. Responsible parenting is promoted and supported.
- C. Parents play an integral role in assisting student learning. The School will help parents understand the state's academic standards, student progression requirements, and how to monitor their children's progress.
- D. Parents are welcome in school, treated with courtesy and respect, and their support and assistance are sought.
- E. Parents are full partners in the decisions that affect children and families.
- F. Community resources are utilized to strengthen school programs, family practices, and student learning.

The school will communicate parental choices and responsibilities to parents. Emphasis will be placed on active parent involvement at each school. The following are examples of family and community involvement communication:

- Open House
- School web page
- Focus
- Parent phone calls, School Reach, Social Media, Remind App, and face-to face meetings
- College and Career Fairs
- Nassau County School District App

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00