Okeechobee County School District

Yearling Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Yearling Middle School

925 NW 23RD LN, Okeechobee, FL 34972

http://yearlingmiddleschool.sites.thedigitalbell.com/

Demographics

Principal: David Krakoff

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	97%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Okeechobee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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

Yearling Middle School's mission is to deliver standards-based, student-centered, authentic learning opportunities that guide all students to be able to work collaboratively and individually while demonstrating mastery of standards.

Provide the school's vision statement

Yearling Middle School will guide all students to deepened levels of thinking and real-world applications of knowledge and skills to prepare them for success in college and/or careers.

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
Krakoff, David	Principal	Serving as instructional leader while creating and aligning systems to support the deepening of learning and social/emotional development for all students.
Carpenter, Cathleen	Guidance Counselor	
Caves , Walt	Dean	
Heineman, Carrie	Other	
Letcher , Cindy	Teacher, K-12	
Maxwell, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	
Shells, Jerrime	Assistant Principal	
Campbell, Kellyann	Instructional Coach	Providing research-grounded professional development and coaching to guide teachers to mastery of their instructional planning, strategic delivery, and monitoring of student achievement. Also, providing support to close learning gaps among our students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 7/15/2018, David Krakoff

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.*
1

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.*
11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
42

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
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)	97%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	

Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	177	224	212	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	18	23	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	30	35	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	19	14	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	25	35	0	0	0	0	101
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	43	27	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	41	29	0	0	0	0	109

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	50	43	0	0	0	0	140

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 9/29/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	274	243	240	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	64	80	0	0	0	0	227

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	21	42	0	0	0	0	116

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	274	243	240	0	0	0	0	757
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	9	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	64	80	0	0	0	0	227

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	21	42	0	0	0	0	116

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	40%	42%	54%	39%	40%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	48%	54%	49%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	43%	47%	49%	44%	47%
Math Achievement	58%	61%	58%	53%	58%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	60%	57%	64%	67%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	56%	51%	49%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	35%	43%	51%	37%	39%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	51%	60%	72%	44%	55%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**			**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	
	(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**
06	2019	49%	47%	2%	54%	-5%
	2018	39%	41%	-2%	52%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	35%	38%	-3%	52%	-17%
	2018	32%	32%	0%	51%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	36%	37%	-1%	56%	-20%
	2018	41%	40%	1%	58%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	51%	54%	-3%	55%	-4%
	2018	47%	56%	-9%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	55%	-1%	54%	0%
	2018	52%	46%	6%	54%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	49%	51%	-2%	46%	3%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	45%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	36%	41%	-5%	48%	-12%
	2018	37%	37%	0%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	51%	59%	-8%	71%	-20%
2018	41%	50%	-9%	71%	-30%
Compare		10%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	88%	52%	36%	61%	27%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	54%	46%	62%	38%
Compare		-12%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	47%	43%	57%	33%
2018	96%	44%	52%	56%	40%
Compare		-6%			

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	19	33	29	35	55	57	20	34	46		
ELL	31	44	49	51	57	53	13	41	58		
BLK	25	37	33	42	51	42	8	60			
HSP	36	46	41	56	60	57	29	47	60		
MUL	25	21		47	43						
WHT	48	50	48	62	62	61	45	58	64		
FRL	37	43	36	54	61	59	29	49	58		

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	14	37	44	27	52	46	8	20	33		
ELL	26	50	57	45	55	48	30	19			
BLK	11	43	50	24	52	41		8			
HSP	34	48	48	49	61	49	35	38	54		
MUL	55	58		43	52		45				
WHT	48	51	55	63	71	53	48	54	63		
FRL	35	48	49	50	63	49	32	41	49		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	511
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	45
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	
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
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	34
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	55
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	48
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

Yearling's science proficiency rate was 36% and ELA was 40% overall. This reflects a deficiency in reading skills and vocabulary and continued a trend of struggling reading performance over the past decade.

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

Grade 8 ELA was; the only math or ELA grade-level team that had a decline in proficiency rate, dropping from 41% to 36%. The primary factors were staff turnover in mid year, one classroom was filled by a long-term sub all year, and another was new to our school. Also, this team struggled to adapt to our new PLC of planning, instructional delivery, and monitoring of student learning.

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

Our civics score is 20% below the state average. Grades 7 and 8 ELA are both 17% below the state average. We consider our reading deficit as the primary contributing factor to

this issue as our reading performance has continued to decline or be stagnate over the past decade.

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

Grade 6 ELA increased proficiency by 10% and Civics grew by 9%. Our grade 6 ELA team and Civics team each worked well during our Collaborative Learning Team work to effectively unwrap standards, plan units of instruction, and monitor student mastery. Also, these two teams led our school-wide movement toward level 4 work on Marzano's taxonomy using project-based learning as the catalyst.

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

Our data indicates a trend of concerns in the area of attendance, suspensions, and state testing data with regard to at risk students. With this data, we have developed a plan to help students gain traction as successful students by conducting grade-level social-emotional restorative discussions and assigning mentors to all students who have 20 or more unexcused absences from school.

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

1.ELA proficiency and growth
2. Science proficiency
3. Civics proficiency
4. Reduction of behavior referrals by changing student behavior and by supporting our staff in building positive, supportive relationships with all students and in embracing the AVID mindset that opportunities truly are limitless for all students.
5. Growth in proficiency in subgroup areas including our ESE, multi-raical, and African-American populations. This will include work to strengthen our cultural competency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our ELA proficiency rates have declined or remained stagnate over the past decade and our low level of performance is also impacting proficiency rates in science and civics.
Measureable Outcome:	e are focused on improving our ELA proficiency rate by 10% from 40% to at least 50% in 2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will focus on Tier 2 vocabulary using strategies based on Marzano's research on vocabulary acquisition. We will work to increase reading comprehension and analysis-level student work by building a campus-wide system for annotating text, using close reading strategies, and a text-based writing approach across our curriculum. AVID's WICOR strategies will be used as a support to this work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our students' ability to work with text on deeper levels of Marzano's taxonomy and to develop writing skills in response to texts will be supported by a uniformed, campus-wide approach to reading and writing.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Campus-wide professional development of AVID strategies
2. Campus-wide professional development of text annotations, contextual vocabulary growth, and RACE writing.
3. Monitoring of implementation of strategies during CLT work and classroom instruction using walk-thru tool
4. Teachers will use deliberate practice plans to support growth in reading and writing instruction and will be monitored during administrative evaluations.

Person Responsible	David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Cultural competency with approach to subgroups including African-American students, ESE students, and multi-racial students. The subgroups including our African-American students, multi-racial students, and ESE students have performed a lower level than is acceptable, reflecting a disconnect with our approach and connection with these groups of students.
Measureable Outcome:	We will work to reduce suspensions by 50% with these subgroups compared to the 2018-19 school year. We will also work to reduce increase proficiency rates by 10% for each of these subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will form a cultural competency committee and analyze our subgroup data and anecdotal evidence and then find research-based approaches to train students and staff on cultural competency.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We want to make this a community initiative and gain buy-in so that we can make a systemic change in our approaches and the results for our subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guiding Coalition will analyze subgroup data
2. Cultural competency committee formed
3. Research done by committee on cultural competency training
4. Action plan developed and implemented to train staff and students
5. Data will be monitored quarterly and analyzed throughout the year to determine impact

Person Responsible David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have noticed a disconnect with our SWD students as well as our Black and Multiracial students when it comes to literacy. The data has revealed this trend.
Measureable Outcome:	We are targeting for 70% of SWD students and Black and Multiracial students to demonstrate growth in reading during the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We have unleveled our ELA classrooms and scheduled students in a balanced way so that choral and collaborative learning support fluency and comprehension gains. Also, based on AVID and Marzano research, we are utlizing higher-performing readers as student aids in ELA classes to peer mentor in the area of reading.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have many readers who are below grade level and need higher level readers to learn from. This will enable all students to gain access to rigor.

Action Steps to Implement

Our guiding coalition is working to support the differentiated instruction needed to support our unleveled classes through professoinal learning sessions. This is being monitored with walk-thrus and coaching sesssions.

Person Responsible	David Krakoff (david.krakoff@okee.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will prioritize mental health, student and staff mindset, and school culture by using AVID strategies, collaborative learning teams, an enhanced PBIS system, and Growth Mindset as a foundation for this work. AVID strategies will be modeled during staff development sessions followed by collection of data during classrooms walks to monitor and adjust implementation. We will use Dr. Carol Dweck's research on Growth Mindset to drive mental health and mindset development during our mid-day lunch period. Our PBIS system will work to support positive social behavior and relationships between staff and students. Our CLTs will help to support instructional planning that supports collaborative learning and high expectations for all students while deliberately planning for differentiated instruction to result in equity. Also, to support our African-American subgroup, we will form a cultural comptency committee and visit data and research-based practices to examine and revise our approach to support learning among this subgroup. This will result in an action plan for professional development for staff and students to increase our cultural competency to close gaps with our African-American subgroup.

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.

Members of Yearling Middle School's Guiding Coalition will routinely communicate with all stakeholders via our school's Facebook page, school website, and via school newsletter. An open house will be held for parents to visit students' classrooms and teachers. In addition, the Guiding Coalition will hold quarterly Summits to discuss school initiatives and respond to concerns from the community.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.