
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	18

Colonial Elementary School

3800 SCHOOLHOUSE RD E, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://cnl.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Eric Washington

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Colonial Elementary School

3800 SCHOOLHOUSE RD E, Fort Myers, FL 33916

<http://cnl.leeschools.net/>

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	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	93%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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 Colonial Elementary is to be a community of students, parents, and staff dedicated to the development of every student's desire to learn and achieve. Collectively, we will provide a safe, supportive environment that fosters curiosity, confidence, and a lifelong passion for learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Colonial Elementary is to provide a safe and encouraging environment where students are inspired to achieve their best each day.

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
Washington, Eric	Principal	Instructional Leader; other members of the Leadership team send agenda items to principal in regards to concerns of grade level teams or departments during their PLCs. Principal facilitates discussion of concerns with the rest of the team as they work towards solutions or options for the PLCs.
Allevato, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	Coaching teachers, classroom instruction, lead PLC meetings, and tracks math and science data. Any concerns, questions, or topics for discussion are given during team/department PLC meetings that are then shared with Principal who places items on agenda to be discussed during Leadership PLC meetings. Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities.
Ball, Sally	Teacher, K-12	PLC Chair for 4th Grade; Coaching teachers, classroom instruction, lead PLC meetings, and ELA data. Any concerns, questions, or topics for discussion are given during team/department PLC meetings that are then shared with Principal who places items on agenda to be discussed during Leadership PLC meetings. Member then takes information back to their PLC team. Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities.
Donnelly, Susan	Other	PBIS coach and resource support in the classroom; Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities. As the PBIS coach and resource support, any concerns observed on campus or in classrooms is provided during Leadership meeting.
Dwyer, Lindsey	School Counselor	The School Counselor is responsible for individual counseling, small group intervention support, large group guidance, and meeting with parents in regards to any concerns that may arise. Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports mental health, instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities. As the School Counselor, any concerns that are observed on campus and/or in classrooms will be provided during Leadership meetings.
Gregory, Eric	Other	Technology Specialist and teaches tech classes. Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities. As the Tech Specialist and tech teacher, any concerns observed on campus or in classrooms is provided during Leadership meeting.
Gregory, Tracy	Other	MTSS Intervention Support Person, Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		parent involvement activities. Any concerns observed on campus or in classrooms is provided during Leadership meeting.
Speiser, Justin	Instructional Coach	Coaching teachers, classroom instruction, lead PLC meetings, and tracks math data. Any concerns, questions, or topics for discussion are given during team/department PLC meetings that are then shared with Principal who places items on agenda to be discussed during Leadership PLC meetings. Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities.
Whitten, Anna	Teacher, K-12	PLC Chair for KG. Any concerns, questions, or topics for discussion are given during team/department PLC meetings that are then shared with Principal who places items on agenda to be discussed during Leadership PLC meetings. Member then takes information back to their PLC team. Member may serve on an ad hoc committee that supports instruction, student engagement, behavior, and parent involvement activities.
Fisher, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Gr. K-2 Administrator. Duties and responsibilities include but are not limited to Lee Connect, APPLES, Transportation and Bus Ramp, Handbooks, Schedules, Lesson Plans, and Cafe.
Ochoa, Yelennys	Assistant Principal	Gr. 3-5: Principal's Discretion, Lee Home Connect, Google Classroom, Discipline, Attendance, PLC, PBIS, ESE/ESO/MTSS, Eagle's Next, Building (Custodial, Safety, Title I Crate, Parent Involvement, SIP, Instructional Coaching, Curriculum Nights & Special Events.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/13/2020, Eric Washington

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.*

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.*

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (41%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	133	113	129	129	124	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	720
Attendance below 90 percent	32	30	42	36	37	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/27/2020

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	145	147	128	133	129	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	794
Attendance below 90 percent	42	20	24	25	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	4	6	13	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	24	45	39	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	61	64	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	14	6	15	41	40	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	3	1	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	145	147	128	133	129	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	794
Attendance below 90 percent	42	20	24	25	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	4	6	13	7	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Course failure in ELA or Math	40	24	45	39	41	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	61	64	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	176

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	14	6	15	41	40	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151

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	3	1	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	57%	57%	39%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	56%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	50%	53%	62%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	47%	62%	63%	54%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	65%	62%	72%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	54%	51%	66%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	52%	53%	26%	51%	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	37%	58%	-21%	58%	-21%
	2018	29%	55%	-26%	57%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	34%	55%	-21%	58%	-24%
	2018	32%	53%	-21%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	37%	54%	-17%	56%	-19%
	2018	31%	52%	-21%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	61%	-9%	62%	-10%
	2018	28%	58%	-30%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	62%	-25%	64%	-27%
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	39%	58%	-19%	60%	-21%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	28%	50%	-22%	53%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	24%	52%	-28%	55%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	20	40	44	34	64	67	22				
ELL	32	43	53	38	59	59	13				
BLK	39	50	50	46	54	50	25				
HSP	36	51	52	49	64	63	39				
WHT	45	50		36	53						
FRL	37	50	51	43	56	56	26				
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	24	35	31	29	35	14	28				
ELL	18	50	50	39	50	45	14				
BLK	32	41	41	41	47	41	13				
HSP	35	47	47	45	56	38	42				
MUL	67			75							
WHT	53	38		56	50						
FRL	35	42	43	44	52	41	27				
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	13	37	50	31	63	76	13				
ELL	35	68	60	49	82	69	18				
BLK	33	51	64	49	64	61	20				
HSP	46	68	59	60	84	75	32				
WHT	41	46		63	75						
FRL	37	56	60	52	71	67	26				

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	48

ESSA Federal Index	
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	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	387
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	44
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	
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	48
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	51
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	
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	46
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	47
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.

ELA proficiency continues to be our lowest performance area. Our students come to school with very little early learning and exposure to learning and language. They often have families who do no or cannot engage in activities at home to support their learning. 2018-2019 School year --We were at 39% proficiency at the end of 3rd quarter for the 19/20 school year. We are at 42% proficiency. Our goal was to be at 45 % proficiency.

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

Our greatest decline was in the area of Math proficiency according to the data, we were at 47% proficient at the end of the 19/20 school year. Teachers are following a new scope and sequence which has not exposed students to the same standards as previous years t the time of third quarter progress monitoring. At mid year we were at 28% proficiency with a goal of 55% proficiency fo the 19/20 school year.

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.

The performance category with the greatest gap in comparison to the state is science proficiency. One of the greatest contributing factors is that our ELA proficiency is low and the science test requires students to read complex text. For the 18/19 school year the State Science proficiency was 53%. Colonial Elementary was at 29% proficiency. The District Science proficiency was at 50%.

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

When comparing schoolwide data from FY19 and FY20, our science proficiency numbers have made the greatest gain. Our third quarter numbers had already reached FY19 end of year numbers. This is attributed to a school wide focus on systematic science instruction and focus on third and fourth grade standards taught previously. For the 18/19 school year we were at 29% proficiency. However we are steadily making progress. At the end of Quarter 3 progress monitoring, are at a 45% proficiency.

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

Attendance continues to be a problem for Colonial. Due to the families living in poverty, school is not always a priority. Colonial leads the district in chronic absenteeism. Additionally, discipline referrals are near the top of district data. For the 18-19 school year we had 16.2% of our students chronically absent. By the end of the 1st semester, we had 17.5 of our students chronically absent.

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

1. Decrease the number of chronically absent students from 135 to 125.
2. Decrease the number of discipline referrals from 600 to 580.
3. Increase ELA proficiency percentages from 45 to 48 ELA proficiency. Increase Math proficiency percentages from 47 to 50.
4. Increase Science proficiency percentages from 35 to 40

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

We are a PBIS school.

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: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00