



---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Pleasant Grove Elementary School

630 PLEASANT GROVE RD, Inverness, FL 34452

<https://pge.citruschools.org/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Rob Hermann**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Citrus 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](http://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

Within our four strong walls at PGE, we strive as companions to nurture excellence, celebrate the worth of each person, foster respect for one another and promote never ending learning.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

### 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
Hermann, Rob	Principal	
Haynes, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Alligood, Jerrica	Instructional Coach	
Schultz, Samantha	Guidance Counselor	
Babyak, Holly	Other	ESE Specialist
	Other	Media Specialist

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Rob Hermann

**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.*

0

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

34

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	69%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	33	97	100	110	90	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	526
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	4	5	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	5	4	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	4	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

**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	1	1	2	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	5	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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**

Tuesday 6/30/2020

**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	110	125	105	84	110	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	34	16	14	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	2	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**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	6	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	110	125	105	84	110	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	640
Attendance below 90 percent	34	16	14	7	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	3	3	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

**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	2	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

**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	6	14	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	69%	59%	57%	66%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	56%	58%	54%	50%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	53%	44%	41%	48%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	63%	70%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains	49%	54%	62%	62%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	39%	51%	46%	39%	47%
Science Achievement	61%	60%	53%	58%	61%	55%

**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	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	57%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	55%	12%	58%	9%
	2018	72%	54%	18%	56%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	68%	58%	10%	56%	12%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	72%	58%	14%	62%	10%
	2018	79%	67%	12%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	59%	11%	64%	6%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	63%	60%	3%	60%	3%
	2018	61%	61%	0%	61%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	62%	58%	4%	53%	9%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	36	61	53	48	52	36	27				
ELL	80			70							
BLK	50			40							
HSP	86	70		86	30						
MUL	50			75							
WHT	70	58	46	69	51	33	63				
FRL	65	55	39	67	50	33	61				

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	24	42	41	36	50	38	21				
HSP	81	60		81	80						
MUL	75	64		58	70						
WHT	67	54	52	71	61	48	61				
FRL	61	50	45	67	58	43	55				

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	56
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### **Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends**

The 2019 math learning gains of the bottom quartile 31% showed the lowest performance. Challenges to providing consistent and rigorous math interventions may have contributed to the performance. Based on iReady diagnostic performance in 2020 the geometry domain was the lowest domain for students in all grades.

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

Math learning gains of the 4th and 5th grade students in 2019 was the greatest decline with a 13% point decrease from the prior year. Challenges to providing consistent and rigorous math interventions may have contributed to the performance.

#### **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**

Performance of Students with Disabilities and African American/Black students displayed the greatest gap when compared to state averages. One interventionist left the staff in 2019. ESE teachers primarily supported ESE students through accommodations and supplementary instruction.

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

2019 5th grade English Language Arts data increased significantly with a 16% point gain. A full-time ESE teacher and ESE aide supported the 5th grade level. Learning gains of this group were above average at 53%.

Current year 2020 iReady data indicated the following results from diagnostic 1 (August) to diagnostic 2 (January)- Math at risk decrease from 9% to 5%, 67% to 47% in the yellow tier 2, and an increase from 23% to 48% in the green tier 1; Reading at risk decrease from 12% to 7%, 53% to 39% in the yellow tier 2, and 35% to 54% in the green tier 1. This indicates identifiable progress from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 2 in both Reading and Math. Two interventionists school-wide served students consistently in all grades. Ready LAFS and MAFS curriculum along with the iReady online component were implemented school-wide.

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

In 5th grade (cohort 20-21) we noted some commensurate data in the areas of course failures, suspensions, and level 1 FSA scores. We hope to address these challenges with our improvement goals and focus on social emotional wellness.

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

1. ELA Gains
2. Math Gains
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our school data in the area of 2019 ELA learning gains of the bottom quartile indicates some improvement, but subgroups data indicates a need for continued growth. Specifically students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch 39% underperformed the group at 45%.  
 2019-20 iReady data from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 2 - Reading at risk decrease from 12% to 7%, 53% to 39% in the yellow tier 2, and 35% to 54% in the green tier 1.

The ELA learning gains of the bottom quartile overall will increase by at least 3% to meet the 2019 district average of 48%.

**Measureable Outcome:** The ELA tier 1 (green) student percentage will increase 20% from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. For example, if diagnostic 1 tier 1 (green) is 40% it will increase to 60%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rob Hermann (hermannr@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implementation of iReady and Ready LAFS as core curriculum elements with integration of other standards-based supports. Utilization of instructional coaches to support continued implementation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** iReady is a research-based curriculum which allows for standards-based instruction along with individualized instruction to support students in their areas of identified need. The use of coaches in supporting instruction is research and evidence based.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide 30 minutes daily of LAFS whole group instruction in all grades.
2. Students will complete 45 minutes per week in the iReady online platform focusing on ELA.
3. Instructional coaches will continue to support iReady and Ready implementation and provide professional development ongoing.
4. Teams will meet regularly to analyze data from iReady and other formative assessments (district, classroom, teacher developed) to identify student needs for instruction.

**Person Responsible** Rob Hermann (hermannr@citruschools.org)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Our school data in the area of Math achievement dropped 1% from 2018-2019. Math learning gains dropped significantly. Overall gains in 2019 were 49% compared to 62% the prior year. The learning gains of the bottom quartile decreased from 46% in 2018 to 31% in 2019.

Current year 2020 iReady data indicated the following results from diagnostic 1 (August) to diagnostic 2 (January)- Math at risk decrease from 9% to 5%, 67% to 47% in the yellow tier 2, and an increase from 23% to 48% in the green tier 1.

**Measureable Outcome:**

The Math learning gains of the bottom quartile overall will increase by at least 8% to meet the 2019 district average of 39%.

The ELA tier 1 (green) student percentage will increase 20% from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3. For example, if diagnostic 1 tier 1 (green) is 40% it will increase to 60%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Rob Hermann (hermannr@citruschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Implementation of iReady and Ready MAFS as core curriculum elements with integration of other standards-based supports. Utilization of instructional coaches to support continued implementation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

iReady is a research-based curriculum which allows for standards-based instruction along with individualized instruction to support students in their areas of identified need. The use of coaches in supporting instruction is research and evidence based.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide 30 minutes daily of MAFS whole group instruction in all grades.
2. Students will complete 45 minutes per week in the iReady online platform focusing on ELA.
3. Instructional coaches will continue to support iReady and Ready implementation and provide professional development ongoing.
4. Teams will meet regularly to analyze data from iReady and other formative assessments (district, classroom, teacher developed) to identify student needs for instruction.

**Person Responsible**

Rob Hermann (hermannr@citruschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Students returning to school this Fall have been away from school substantially longer than typical. Due to this extended time away, we plan to prioritize awareness and instruction in the area of social emotional skills. All staff will emphasize relationships in their everyday interactions with students and families as well as each other. In order to ensure daily time for social and emotional instruction, each day will begin with a short period reserved specifically for social skills instruction. During this time, Sanford Harmony meet up and buddy up will be implemented daily. In addition, lessons from Sanford Harmony will be taught on a weekly basis. Mindful moments and Words of Wisdom will be offered daily to the entire school at scheduled intervals.**

## 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.

PGE has a rich tradition of involvement. PGE maintains regular communication with families through Class Dojo, email, School Messenger, and direct to family communication. PGE maintains an active presence on social media in order to provide information to proximal and broad stakeholders. 50% of families surveyed in Spring 2020 indicated a preference for communication via Dojo, email, phone, and school messenger.

Staff celebrate once per month to recognize important happenings in the staff personal and professional lives and enjoy social time together. Students are recognized monthly for perseverance and character one per class for each monthly. Through specific criteria students are recognized with charms for honor roll, reading goals, bullying prevention, etc.

PGE involves community members through SAC and PTA. PTA events are held regularly (at least every other month). Local churches support the school through donations and volunteer support.

Students say the STAR pledge and mission statement daily on the news as a reminder of expected behaviors. Teachers reteach expectations for students frequently.

### Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link



The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.