

Orange County Public Schools

John Young Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

John Young Elementary

12550 MARSFIELD AVE, Orlando, FL 32837

<https://johnyounges.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Lino Rodriguez

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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 Orange 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

With the support of families and the community, we create exciting and diverse pathways to lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

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
Rodriguez, Lino	Principal	
Speights, Tyisha	Assistant Principal	
McCall, Katie	Guidance Counselor	
Brown, Bevan	Instructional Coach	
Garris, Robert	Dean	
Ryerson, Felicia	Instructional Coach	
Hill, Tara	Instructional Coach	
Ellis, Jessica	Instructional Coach	
Geenen, Mary	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Lino Rodriguez

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.*

2

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	73%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
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	37	106	90	104	139	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	579
Attendance below 90 percent	130	11	11	11	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	3	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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		1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/18/2020

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	70	91	103	152	106	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	646
Attendance below 90 percent	2	9	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	13	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	4	7	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	48	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	16	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	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	70	91	103	152	106	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	646
Attendance below 90 percent	2	9	7	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	13	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	4	7	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	48	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

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	0	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	4	1	16	7	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Students retained two or more times	0	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	57%	57%	57%	58%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	58%	58%	59%	55%	55%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	52%	53%	50%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	69%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	72%	61%	62%	56%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	48%	51%	48%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	54%	56%	53%	64%	55%	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	61%	55%	6%	58%	3%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	57%	-7%	58%	-8%
	2018	54%	54%	0%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	62%	11%	62%	11%
	2018	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	63%	17%	64%	16%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	56%	57%	-1%	60%	-4%
	2018	67%	59%	8%	61%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	54%	-3%	53%	-2%
	2018	63%	53%	10%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	24	36	37	38	56	67	7				
ELL	52	55	60	65	73	72	43				
ASN	67	58		83	84						
BLK	54	42		63	75		57				
HSP	48	54	61	66	69	68	49				
WHT	71	58		82	78		62				
FRL	51	53	63	67	72	73	50				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	35	36	28	51	50	20				
ELL	41	43	43	52	42	38	36				
ASN	77	77		86	77		74				
BLK	70	68		68	61		91				
HSP	49	53	43	63	51	39	64				
WHT	64	61		75	57		43				
FRL	54	55	48	66	54	46	57				

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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	70
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
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	60
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

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	70
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	62
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA learning gains. Although the majority of our professional learning opportunities focused on ELA, emphasis was placed on foundational skills and providing targeted intervention to struggling students. While this contributed to gains for our students in the lowest quartile, it may have unintentionally created an imbalance of targeted classroom instruction and support for the remaining students. Over the past 3 years, the rate of student proficiency has fluctuated. Based on classroom assessments and mid-year iReady data during the 2019-2020 school year, we believe that the trend would continue.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline based on the 2019 data was fifth grade science. Using this data, interventions were put in place to help address the contributing factors for that time period. Based on the 2019-2020 PMAs, the data showed a positive trend towards student proficiency.

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 data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was ELA learning gains. As previously stated, the majority of our professional learning opportunities focused on ELA. Emphasis was placed on foundational skills and providing targeted intervention to struggling students. While this contributed to gains for students in the lowest quartile, it may have unintentionally created an imbalance of targeted classroom instruction and support for the remaining students.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the lowest 25% in math. During this past year, our school has provided differentiated support through small group instruction, during After School tutoring, and Saturday School. In addition, instructional support/coaching was provided. New resources were also provided to support standards-based instruction as well as to build foundational skills in number sense.

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

In reflecting on the EWS data, a potential area of concern is the amount of students that received a Level 1 on FSA ELA and/or Math in 2019.

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

1. Maintain safety of Staff and Students
2. Mental Health and Social-Emotional Competencies
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Math Proficiency
5. Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: John Young Elementary will use a workshop model to teach the writing process to develop intrinsic motivation for writing through immersion in the various writing genres, while embedding instruction of skills and conventions of writing into shared and modeled writing experiences. Additionally, iReady writing will also be embedded as an additional resource for writing instruction.

We will also incorporate a Writers Workshop model to encourage students to write regularly with passion and intent while building an understanding of the skills and conventions of writing.

Our 2018-2019 data showed that our lowest performance area was in ELA learning gains which led the school to focus on this area. One of the action steps was to have the school-based DPLC team to present learned content in the areas of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) and Writing. By continuing this area of focus, we will have the ability to deepen our instructional practices.

Measureable Outcome: Using a district approved writing rubric (given 3 times; beginning, middle and end of school year), 80 % of students scoring at the beginning levels (Level 1 or 2) will move to Proficient writers (level 3) by the close of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will provide process and comprehensive writing instruction to students which will allow them to provide multiple opportunities for writing for various purposes and audiences.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Comprehensive writing instruction allows for explicit instruction in the writing process and skills. Process writing allows students to write authentically and allows for student writers to have a more personal approach to writing through a supportive writing environment and conferencing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide the opportunity for teachers to participate in collaborative planning with their colleagues
2. Provide professional development on instructional strategies related to writing workshops
3. Incorporate data-driven discussion in order to provide targeted instruction
4. Provide coaching support and specific, actionable feedback based on observations
5. Differentiate professional development accordingly based on ongoing teacher observation and teacher needs
6. Provide various types of resources to meet student instructional needs

Person Responsible Felicia Ryerson (felicia.ryerson@ocps.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Due to recent situation with Covid-19 and the impact it has had on students, families, and staff, we will involve all students and families in a research-based social and emotional learning (SEL) program that builds school-wide community, develops students’ social skills and SEL competencies, and enables a transformative stance on discipline.

Measureable Outcome: By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, John Young Elementary will maintain an average rating of a 4.5 or higher in all five domains of the Cognia Accreditation Climate Surveys for all stakeholders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: To create in students an emotional attachment to school and promote positive behavior through direct teaching of responsibility, empathy, and cooperation, creating settings where students feel heard, known, and cared for.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Providing opportunities for students to interact and collaborate is fundamental for student growth. Students become intrinsically motivated to contribute productively to a community they feel invested in, and where they know they matter.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Assign an administrative lead to monitor and support the continuation of the SEL curriculum implementation in all classrooms
2. Continue to facilitate deliberate conversations in large and small setting with teachers about the impact of SEL teaching in their classrooms
3. Dedicate intentional PLC time devoted to sharing and exploring the District SELL content with specific focus on the SEL competencies
4. Incorporate Collaborative School Communities Home Connections to involve families in the program being used in classrooms
5. Provide a variety of CASEL research-based resources and opportunities for practice/ modeling during PLCs
6. Continue to offer professional development to all staff in order to create a culture of kindness and respect and a safe and supportive environment

Person Responsible Lino Rodriguez (lino.rodriguez@ocps.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to K-2 Guided Reading Instructional Practices

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: John Young Elementary primary teachers will participate in OCPS K-2 Impact Training in order to support a strategic shift in literacy instruction, with a specific emphasis on small group instruction that involves intentional planning and responsive decision-making based on students' individual needs as readers.
 Our 2018-2019 data showed that our lowest performance area was in ELA learning gains which led the school to focus on this area.

Measurable Outcome: Teacher pedagogical content knowledge assessment for teaching small group instruction will be administered prior to and after each session. 80% of participating teachers will show content knowledge growth from session one to the final session.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tyisha Speights (58416@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: K-2 teachers will implement small group reading frameworks that are inclusive of research-based instructional and assessment practices in literacy, with an emphasis on alignment to the larger "literacy block."

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Effective professional learning is embedded in classroom practice and occurs daily as teachers try new and proven approaches, observe students, and reflect on outcomes. Teachers deepen their understandings about effective practice as they plan for, teach, and reflect on instruction in their own classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide the opportunity for K-2 teachers to participate in collaborative planning with their colleagues
2. Administrator & Literacy Coaches from JYE will participate with teachers
3. Provide professional development on instructional strategies related to guided reading instruction in collaboration with OCPS and UCF
4. Incorporate data-driven discussion in order to provide targeted instruction
5. Provide coaching support and specific, actionable feedback based on observations
6. District leaders from OCPS Elementary Curriculum and Instruction will provide feedback and vetting of all materials developed and implemented in this professional learning opportunity
7. Provide various types of resources to meet student instructional needs

Person Responsible: Felicia Ryerson (felicia.ryerson@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school-based leadership team will address math and science proficiency by providing additional professional development, support, and instructional coaching focused on differentiated instruction in both math and science. We will monitor the teachers' use of the district's Scope and Sequence and revised CRMs. We will also monitor student progress through the use of iReady and the PMAs.

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.

Our school team models for our students the very competencies we focus on during the school year during morning meetings, closing meetings, and any authentic opportunity throughout the day to promote our students' social-emotional well-being.

- 1) Identifying emotions
- 2) Teamwork
- 3) Relationship building
- 4) Appreciating diversity
- 5) Respect for others
- 6) Goal setting
- 7) Communication
- 8) Stress management
- 9) Identifying/Solving problems
- 10) Reflecting

Through our use of the Caring School Communities curriculum, our students work hard in their studies, find and express their voice in morning meetings and through their writing, help their classmates and their younger "classroom buddies", act in a safe manner on campus and, perhaps most importantly, demonstrate resilience and kindness.

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: K-2 Guided Reading Instructional Practices	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00