

Nassau County School District

Bryceville Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bryceville Elementary School

6504 CHURCH AVE, Bryceville, FL 32009

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Bryceville Elementary School

6504 CHURCH AVE, Bryceville, FL 32009

[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 KG-5	Yes	49%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	6%

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.

Our mission at Bryceville Elementary School is to provide an environment where each student will aspire to be a life-long learner and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Bryceville Elementary School, we are committed to creating an environment that successfully prepares students to achieve academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>The school-based leadership team is responsible for disaggregating and analyzing data to determine areas of deficit. The team is to identify problems within the general population of students and within subgroups of students, analyze why the problems are occurring, formulate an intervention plan and then measure the effectiveness of the interventions through regular progress monitoring. Their plan to address and remediate areas of deficit becomes the basis for the school improvement plan and school action plan. The Leadership Team is responsible for ensuring that the school has in place a system that provides increasingly intense and individualized interventions, resources and supports needed to meet the unique needs of its students.</p> <p>In order to identify those needs, the team must analyze data to determine deficits and other areas in need of improvement. The team looks at academic, attendance, and behavior data. As the team disaggregates the data, it is identifying which students are meeting grade level expectations and which are not. It is looking of patterns and trends in the date. The leadership team meets monthly.</p>
Smith, Tammy	Principal	<p>Leading questions: Is our core instruction meeting the needs of 75-80 % of our students? If not, is it a curriculum or instruction issue? Are certain groups of students failing to meet expectations in certain subjects? Or, are there certain groups who have other non-academic barriers to achievement that must be addressed before they will be able to meet academic success? Are there trends in achievement within specific subgroups that need to be addressed? Have resources (funding and staffing) been allocated in the most effective and efficient manner to meet the needs of all stakeholders?</p> <p>Once those areas of need have been identified, the leadership team disseminates this information to the departments, literacy teams and other school based teams. The teams will provide input to the leading questions and assist in determining appropriate research based interventions to remediate specific deficits and identify other available resources to meet individual student needs. The departments/teams oversee the implementation of the interventions and monitor student progress through regularly scheduled meetings. The progress monitoring information will be shared with the leadership team and departments/teams together will monitor the effectiveness of interventions through student progress monitoring data and fidelity checks.</p>
Davis, Latashia	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
White, Jessica	Teacher, ESE	
Sawicki, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	
Butler, Sue	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Tammy Smith

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (71%) 2015-16: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	35	42	37	30	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	197
Attendance below 90 percent	4	4	2	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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

Monday 10/19/2020

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	42	33	34	26	32	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
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	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	

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	

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	42	33	34	26	32	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202
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	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	

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	

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	84%	76%	57%	68%	73%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	65%	58%	63%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	53%	50%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	85%	63%	84%	82%	61%
Math Learning Gains	80%	77%	62%	85%	71%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	67%	51%	83%	64%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	75%	53%	65%	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	87%	75%	12%	58%	29%
	2018	71%	76%	-5%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	68%	15%	58%	25%
	2018	62%	69%	-7%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	82%	75%	7%	56%	26%
	2018	74%	71%	3%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	83%	3%	62%	24%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	76%	80%	-4%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	91%	81%	10%	64%	27%
	2018	84%	83%	1%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	82%	86%	-4%	60%	22%
	2018	86%	79%	7%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	73%	1%	53%	21%
	2018	74%	72%	2%	55%	19%
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	71	75		79	80		58				
WHT	84	74	56	89	81	71	73				
FRL	80	66	55	80	74	64	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	43	60		67	67						
WHT	70	58	62	84	69	59	77				
FRL	62	54	50	77	69	46	67				
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	35	47	40	61	80	80					
WHT	70	64	50	85	83	83	64				
FRL	53	50	42	78	82	70	61				

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	75
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	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	73
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	75
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	69
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.

Science. Although Science achievement is above the state average, it is the lowest area for our 3rd - 5th grade students. Contributing factors are lack of Science spiral review, need to better understand the standards, and need for gradual release of Science content in 3rd through 5th grades.

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

ELA Lowest 25% declined 4%, although the percentage is greater than the state average. New students with IEPs contributed to the decline. As a small school, one to two student comprise the 4%.

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.

It is a trend that BES, along with Nassau County elementary schools, consistently perform above the state average.

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

5th grade ELA achievements showed the greatest improvement, a 21% improvement for the cohort of students. The fifth grade teachers delved into the ELA standards and redesigned activities to align more closely to the standards. Admin and Reading Coach taught daily in centers in 5th grade ELA

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

After reflecting on our EWS data, we will continue to monitor and implement strategies that will improve attendance.

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

1. Maintaining 3rd - 5th grade achievement
2. Increasing Science achievement
3. Increasing Writing achievement within ELA
4. Increasing SAT-10 Reading achievement in K-2
5. Increasing SAT-10 Math achievement in K-2

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our ELA proficiency school-wide was 84% in 2019. Our district expectation is 80%. Our priority is to maintain ELA achievement in grades 3-5 and increase ELA proficiency of primary students in K-2. Our iReady BOY data for Fall 2020 suggests that there has been an increase in the number of students who need interventions to fill skill gaps.

Measurable Outcome: Maintain an ELA proficiency of at least 84%, with a stretch goal of increasing by 3% in grades 3-5. Increasing ELA proficiency in grades K-2 by 3%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement intentional differentiated ELA instruction based on diagnostic data (phonics screeners, Lexia, iReady & STAR) and progress monitor individual student achievement and growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on previous FSA, SAT-10 and current diagnostic assessments (iReady, STAR, and Benchmarks) our data reveals the need for continuing to make adjustments in differentiated small group instruction, provide targeted additional instruction through tutoring and intervention blocks, and progress monitor to identify skill gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Differentiated small group instruction
2. After school tutoring program
3. Tiered support through MTSS process
4. Collaborative Planning
5. Targeted ELA Professional Development

Person Responsible Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 2019 attendance data, there were no BES students that did not maintain a 90% attendance rate. According to the 1st quarter attendance data for 2020, BES is demonstrating that 9% of the students are not maintaining a 90% attendance rate. It appears that BES attendance is not improving.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the 20-21, the goal of BES is to decrease the percentage of students absent for more than 10% of the school year by 2%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase parent and student communication of attendance policies, progress toward desired goals and use positive student classroom and school-wide reinforcers regarding attendance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	It is evident that parent/student communication and reinforcement is needed to express the importance of attendance and correlation to student achievement. Consistent student attendance increases student academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Tiered System of Support (letters, phone calls, relationships)
2. Positive celebrations for students who maintain perfect attendance
3. Increase parent communication of attendance policies
4. Home visits for truant students
5. Parent/Teacher follow-up regarding attendance

Person Responsible Tammy Smith (smithta@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.

BES identified ELA as the focus this year, but will continue to monitor Math achievement data based on diagnostic assessments from iReady.

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 parent involvement in the school. The school will coordinate and integrate parental involvement strategies including community involvement opportunities and business partnerships. School staff, faculty and administrator strive to strengthen family involvement and family empowerment in the school.

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 students learning. The school will help parents understand the state's academic standards, student progression requirements, and how to monitor their child's progress.
- D. Parents are welcome in school, treated with courtesy and respect, and their support and assistance is 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. The following are examples of family and community involvement communication:

- Open House, Parent Nights
- School Web Page
- FOCUS
- Newsletters communicating classroom and school news to parents
- Parent phone calls, ParentLink, conferences, school marquee, Remind 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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------