

Okaloosa County School District

James E Plew Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

James E Plew Elementary School

220 PINE AVE, Niceville, FL 32578

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Tammy Matz

Start Date for this Principal: 5/29/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (68%) 2018-19: A (77%) 2017-18: A (72%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Okaloosa 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	10
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

James E Plew Elementary School

220 PINE AVE, Niceville, FL 32578

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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.

Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Plew Elementary shares the OCSD Vision, Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom. Plew Elementary used the district created Shared Values and expanded upon how those values looked specifically at our school:

Passionate – At Plew, teachers are enthusiastic and engaged in student growth and development.

Data Based – At Plew we use common planning and student goal setting; our instruction is driven through the data we acquire.

Accountability – At Plew we hold our students accountable behaviorally through PBIS and academically using "I can..." statements and student-driven goal setting.

Listen – At Plew, actionable steps are taken based on needs identified by our community survey. The use of student discourse in the classroom promotes better student learning and understanding.

Learners – Plew teachers are routinely fostering lifelong learning by encouraging student collaboration, providing engaging lessons, and sharing their passion for student growth.

Coach/Development – At Plew we focus on balanced, purposeful, relevant professional development and readily share our strengths and expertise with colleagues.

Humility – At Plew we use the MTSS process and support is provided for students, families, and teachers to meet academic and behavioral needs. The Plew staff is willing to consider or accept new suggestions and ideas. We aim to support a culture of cooperation.

Relationships – Plew builds relationships through PLA, volunteers, Evening of the Arts, Science Night, Fun Runs, parent patio lunches, Thanksgiving lunch, Open House, Heights, and Kids Kount tutoring, Media Center, Plew gardens, and student clubs.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Matz, Tammy	Principal	Leads school
Phillips, Heather	Assistant Principal	Assist Principal
Carr, Patty	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Math/Grade Level chair
Davis, Austin	Teacher, ESE	5th grade ESE/Grade Level Chair
Funk, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	3rd Grade ELA/Grade Level Chair
Goodman, Amy	Teacher, K-12	5th grade ELA/Grade Level chair
Graham, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	K teacher/Grade Level chair
Sekas, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	2nd grade ELA/Grade Level Chair
Young, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade/Grade Level chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/29/2019, Tammy Matz

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

825

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

10

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

10

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	121	131	142	143	160	133	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	830
Attendance below 90 percent	0	11	15	8	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	11	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	7	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	6	10	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 9/2/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Number of students enrolled		
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	126	145	130	156	126	158	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	841
Attendance below 90 percent	12	12	8	9	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	10	6	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Course failure in Math	0	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	21	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	5	16	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	4	7	13	10	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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 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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	61%	56%				85%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						73%	64%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						61%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	75%	47%	50%				89%	73%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						83%	70%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						71%	60%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	63%	59%				79%	62%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	86%	66%	20%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	86%	67%	19%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	80%	67%	13%	56%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	85%	73%	12%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	90%	74%	16%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2022					
	2019	88%	71%	17%	60%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	78%	63%	15%	53%	25%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	41	38	31	39	44	42	39				
BLK	50			50							
HSP	72	67		63	76		33				
MUL	72	61	60	69	65		82				
WHT	81	72	62	78	70	49	82				
FRL	59	50	41	56	64	63	48				
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	45	47		51	42	20	40				
BLK	50			55							
HSP	71			68							
MUL	72	67		68	55		64				
WHT	83	66	41	81	59	41	74				
FRL	61	52		57	45		71				

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	61	59	52	65	68	54	56				
BLK	77			77							
HSP	84	76		80	76						
MUL	79	66		91	72		56				
WHT	86	74	63	89	86	73	84				
FRL	67	59	55	70	66	52	47				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	50
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	62
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	68
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	71
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

SWD trend as lowest performing sub group in ELA Lowest 25% at 31% and math Lowest 25% at 42%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

4th grade ELA SWD.
4th grade Math SWD.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

More POC support for our ESE students. Move to afterschool pullouts to reduce the time already pulled from general education classroom during the school day.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Improvement in math learning gains and ELA learning gains.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

For ELA, new curriculum supplied a more rigorous ELA program for students to access. Math teams planned together and used common assessments.

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

The use of iReady tools and data will be used to accelerate learning in both math and ELA. Orton Gillingham will be used with SWD that have specific reading deficits.

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.

iReady training is happening September 26th to train teachers on how to use the prerequisite reports for math and ELA to accelerate learning using additional lessons needed for wholes in learning that are identified.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

POC tutoring is available every year. We need to adjust our focus to include SWD that are pulled for services during the day to extend their day to afterschool pull out to avoid time missed during the general education instruction.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:**

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

Our SWD subgroup for the lowest 25% for ELA is only 31% proficient.
Our SWD subgroup for the lowest 25% for Math is only 42% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our measurable goal would be to improve SWD lowest 25% to 50% proficient in ELA and math.

Monitoring:

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

Data chats, reviewing FAST and iReady data and growth with general education teachers and teachers of SWD.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Matz (tammy.matz@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

For reading, Orton Gillingham and Ready Phonics will be used with SWD. For math, iReady toolbox and the Ready Magnetic books will be used with the SWD.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Using our iReady data, SWD show a significant deficit in the domain of Phonics. The Ready phonics and Orton Gillingham use a multi-sensory approach to fill these deficits. iReady Math uses a differentiated lesson path on the student's level to provide remediation and the iReady toolbox offers several opportunities to accelerate a student's learning.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

What action steps are you taking to achieve your school's vision? At Plew Elementary we believe every student should show one or more years' worth of academic and social emotional growth. As seen through iReady, FAST scores, grades, discipline data and parent feedback. Data will be used during data chats, IPDP's, goal setting with students and used during common plan time to ensure that all students, 100%, will make one or more years' worth of academic growth.

Plew's ROAR honor code, I am a Panther, hear me Roar, I am a Panther, I stand for: R-Responsibility, O-Organization, A-Achieving Goals, R-Respect, Panthers ROAR! Will be recited every morning as part of our PBIS plan. It will be taught by teachers, displayed in classrooms and all over campus; it will assist us with the emotional growth we expect our students to make during the school year.

Our shared values above will help us to achieve our goals. Plew's shared values were created by teachers,

and will be shared with teachers during pre-planning, posted on our website and posted in our classrooms.

This school year our staff turnover is approximately 12 new teachers. Our social team meets once a month to make sure we have a variety of staff get-togethers and social events to attend.

Every faculty meeting will start with an inspirational video to excite and ignite the staff around our Plew Shared Values: September Video-Relationships; Mr. Jensen, October Video-Passionate; Doing Hard Better (future videos will be announced)

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

Tammy Matz

Principal

Heather Phillips

Assistant Principal

Rebecca Graham

K Grade Chair

Teresa Williams/Theresa Young

1st Grade Chair

Lauren Sekas

2nd Grade Chair

Lauren Funk

3rd Grade Chair

Patty Carr

4th Grade Chair

Amy Goodman

5th Grade Chair

Austin Davis

ESE/ Special Area Chair

My Grade Level Chairs created our Shared Values at Plew Elementary with their grade level teams: What is your school's vision? Plew Elementary shares the OCSD Vision, Preparing today's students for success within and beyond the classroom. Plew Elementary used the district created Shared Values and expanded upon how those values looked specifically at our school:

Passionate – At Plew, teachers are enthusiastic and engaged in student growth and development.

Data Based – At Plew we use common planning and student goal setting; our instruction is driven through the data we acquire.

Accountability – At Plew we hold our students accountable behaviorally through PBIS and academically using “I can...” statements and student-driven goal setting.

Listen – At Plew, actionable steps are taken based on needs identified by our community survey. The use of student discourse in the classroom promotes better student learning and understanding.

Learners – Plew teachers are routinely fostering lifelong learning by encouraging student collaboration, providing engaging lessons, and sharing their passion for student growth.

Coach/Development – At Plew we focus on balanced, purposeful, relevant professional development and readily share our strengths and expertise with colleagues.

Humility – At Plew we use the MTSS process and support is provided for students, families, and teachers to meet academic and behavioral needs. The Plew staff is willing to consider or accept new suggestions and ideas. We aim to support a culture of cooperation.

Relationships – Plew builds relationships through PLA, volunteers, Evening of the Arts, Science Night, Fun Runs, parent patio lunches, Thanksgiving lunch, Open House, Heights, and Kids Kount tutoring, Media Center, Plew gardens, and student clubs.