

Jackson County School Board

Hope School



2021-22 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
R.A.I.S.E	0
Positive Culture & Environment	0

Hope School

2958 CHEROKEE STREET, Marianna, FL 32446

<http://hope.jcsb.org>

Demographics

Principal: Millicent Braxton

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	96%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Commendable 2020-21: Commendable 2018-19: Maintaining 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jackson County School Board on 10/19/2021.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Hope School's Mission is to provide a safe secure setting to deliver the instruction and resources needed to help each student reach their maximum potential to become as independent as possible at home, in the community, and during post-secondary education.

"WE SOAR WITH PRIDE"

Provide the school's vision statement.

The purpose of the Jackson County School District is to prepare all students for success as educated and caring citizens by inspiring and building good character and a passion for life-long learning-building a better community one student at a time.

Hope School's vision statement: "WE SOAR WITH PRIDE"

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

The population at Hope School is students that have the most severe cognitive disabilities in the District. We also serve some students out of district with the same severe cognitive disabilities. Supports are intensive instruction with a 3:1 ratio. 3:1 ratio is also for Independent Functioning Skills, Safety Supervision as well as Social Settings.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Braxton, Millicent	Principal	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.
Parrish, Karen	School Counselor	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.
Hand, Joy	Teacher, ESE	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.
Melvin, Sherrie	Teacher, ESE	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.
Blackmon, Cynthia	Teacher, ESE	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.
Wiggins, Tanya	Teacher, ESE	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.
Burge, Emily	Teacher, ESE	School leadership team members meets to review the data and SIP. At the school, the team meets with teachers and staff to collect and analyze student data. The data analysis assisted with interventions based on individual student needs and provided support with technology. The leadership team meets multiple times with PTO, SAC committee, and grade groups to make decisions assisting the educational needs of our student. School leadership team meets multiple times which include regular emails.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.**Demographic Information****Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2013, Millicent Braxton

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

15

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

16

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

121

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	4	8	4	9	9	7	6	9	6	8	4	8	22	104	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	4	11	34	
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	8	

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	
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	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - 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	4	8	4	9	9	7	6	9	6	8	4	8	22	104	
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	3	5	2	2	4	5	5	5	3	3	13	56	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	4	

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	6

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	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	5

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis
School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement					58%	61%		54%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					54%	59%		53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					47%	54%		47%	52%
Math Achievement					55%	62%		55%	61%
Math Learning Gains					52%	59%		52%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					46%	52%		50%	52%
Science Achievement					44%	56%		47%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					69%	78%		61%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	66	81		57	56		65				
BLK	69	80		67	70						
WHT	61	75		58	53		60				
FRL	71	89		60	72		67				
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	57	48		50	47		48	81		60	
BLK	50	10		43	17						
WHT	59	65		54	60		50	88			
FRL	61	50		52	26		54	87			

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

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
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	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	65
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	72
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	72
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place for low performing ESSA subgroups related to the Areas of Focus?

Brigance
iReady
Pre and Post Unique Curriculum

Teacher made checklist

Data Collection of IEP Goals and Short-Term Objective/Benchmarks.

Florida Standard Alternate Assessment

Datafolio

Based on ESSA subgroup progress monitoring, which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

According to the FSAA scores for ELA-Grades 3-8 11 were tested (7 males/4 females) All score proficient. ELA 1 2 BM-Both scored Proficient.

Also data from IEP goals.

Professional Development for Teachers and Paraprofessionals. Teachers participated in professional development on instructional practices, collaborated with peer teachers through grade group meetings, and peer observations. The use of technology in the classrooms

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

According to the FSAA scores for Math-Grades 3-8 11 were tested (7 males/4 females) 7 scored proficient (5 males/2 females).

Data from IEP goals and FSAA scores

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Growth across the board in all areas assessed. Hope School was considered Commendable for school rating by the Florida Department of Education.

What strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We want our students to continue growth as shown last year. We are incorporating new curriculum and technology.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development will be on the new curriculum for teachers. Paraprofessionals will be having technology training from PAEC.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

36% (students taking the FSAA) of Elementary and middle school African-American students did not score proficient on the math FSAA.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Elementary and Middle school African-American students (3-8) Math FSAA scores will improve through the use of evidenced based instructional strategies and new curriculum.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

iReady, Brigance, Pre and Post test on Unique and new curriculum, teacher made checklist and data on IEP goals will be used for monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Millicent Braxton (millicent.braxton@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will help students practice skills, strategies, and processes through demonstration, examples, clear representation of correct procedure, multiple opportunities for structured practice, differentiated instruction, scaffolding adaptations, and retaught as necessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These evidence based strategies will improve the proficiency rate on the FSAA (math) for alternately assessed students.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teacher professional development (instructional practices/subject area content)
2. Implementation of new curriculum
3. Paraprofessional professional development (Technology)
4. Implementation of technology
5. Teacher/paraprofessional collaboration, teacher/teacher collaboration.

Person Responsible

Millicent Braxton (millicent.braxton@jcsb.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2021 Learning Gains was 81%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Hope School is supporting 80% or higher learning gains for 2022.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

iReady, Brigance, Pre and Post test on Unique and new curriculum, teacher made checklist and data on IEP goals will be used for monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Millicent Braxton (millicent.braxton@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will help students practice skills, strategies, and processes through demonstration, examples, clear representation of correct procedure, multiple opportunities for structured practice, differentiated instruction, scaffolding adaptations, and retaught as necessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These evidence based strategies will improve the proficiency rate or learning gains on the FSAA (ELA) for alternately assessed students.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teacher professional development (instructional practices/subject area content)
2. Implementation of new curriculum
3. Paraprofessional professional development (Technology)
4. Implementation of technology
5. Teacher/paraprofessional collaboration, teacher/teacher collaboration.

Person Responsible

Millicent Braxton (millicent.braxton@jcsb.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

All students fall under Students With Disability ESSA subgroups. The subgroup for Students with Disability was 56%. Hope School's progress monitoring will be the same as the subgroups under 41%.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

2021 Learning Gains was 56%.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Hope School will improve math learning gains to 55% for 2022.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

iReady, Brigance, Pre and Post test on Unique and new curriculum, teacher made checklist and data on IEP goals will be used for monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Millicent Braxton (millicent.braxton@jcsb.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Teachers will help students practice skills, strategies, and processes through demonstration, examples, clear representation of correct procedure, multiple opportunities for structured practice, differentiated instruction, scaffolding adaptations, and retaught as necessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

These evidence based strategies will improve the proficiency rate or learning gains on the FSAA (Math) for alternately assessed students.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teacher professional development (instructional practices/subject area content)
2. Implementation of new curriculum
3. Paraprofessional professional development (Technology)
4. Implementation of technology
5. Teacher/paraprofessional collaboration, teacher/teacher collaboration.

Person Responsible

Millicent Braxton (millicent.braxton@jcsb.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

All students fall under Students With Disability ESSA subgroups. The subgroup for Students with Disability was 56%. Hope School's progress monitoring will be the same as the subgroups under 41%.

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.

Hope School has PTO/SAC/SIP meetings, Volunteer programs, Harvest Day, Holiday Program, Awards Day, Progress Reports for parents, Positive phone calls, Daily or weekly notes are sent home, newsletter and Holiday meals provide by the lunchroom (when COVID restriction lifts).

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers communicate with parents/guardians on a regular basis. Teachers attend professional development opportunities and collaborate with colleagues to ensure student needs are met using evidence-based practices.

Paraprofessionals attend professional development opportunities to help support students in the classroom. They actively participate in school activities including Special Olympics events both on and off campus.

PTO will keep parents and teachers updated on current and upcoming events and help support activities through fundraising events.

Parents participate in school activities through volunteer opportunities and provide additional support through fundraising events. Parents are encouraged to actively participate as team members in the IEP process.

Community provides items/donations for special activities and volunteers at special events.

School Originations (BETA, Honors, etc.) attends special activities and gives our students times with non-disabled peers.