

Nassau County School District

Yulee Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Yulee Middle School

85439 MINER RD, Yulee, FL 32097

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: George Raysor

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	44%
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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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 is pending approval by the Nassau 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

Our mission is to develop each student as an inspired life-long learner and problem-solver with the strength of character to serve as a productive member of society.

Provide the school's vision statement

At Yulee Middle School, our vision is to promote, support, and afford students with the opportunity to become productive members of society and life-long learners.

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
Raysor, George	Principal	Principal of Yulee Middle School
Middleton, Tara	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Yulee Middle School
Norfleet, Rachel	Guidance Counselor	School Counselor, MTSS Lead, and SAC Chair
Fletcher, Kelly	Guidance Counselor	School Counselor
Davidson, Heather	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach and MTSS Co-Lead
Schinella, Patrick	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair and SAC Co-Chair
Glover-Crosby, Debra	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Smith, Anna	Teacher, K-12	Math Co-Department Chair
Elwell, Chrissy	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Koenig, Ricci	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, George Raysor

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.*

3

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.*

27

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

68

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)	44%
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 Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
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	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	347	343	349	0	0	0	0	1039
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	51	44	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	51	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	22	42	0	0	0	0	95

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	22	19	40	0	0	0	0	81

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/13/2020

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	357	364	331	0	0	0	0	1052
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	50	39	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	34	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	76	60	0	0	0	0	179

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	8	23	20	0	0	0	0	51

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	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	357	364	331	0	0	0	0	1052
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	50	39	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	34	0	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	76	60	0	0	0	0	179

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	8	23	20	0	0	0	0	51

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	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	5

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	59%	64%	54%	58%	63%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	53%	54%	54%	56%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	44%	47%	45%	48%	47%
Math Achievement	71%	74%	58%	64%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	65%	62%	57%	57%	57%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	51%	47%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	64%	51%	56%	61%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	72%	72%	72%	66%	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	56%	63%	-7%	54%	2%
	2018	60%	64%	-4%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	59%	-4%	52%	3%
	2018	52%	57%	-5%	51%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
08	2019	63%	65%	-2%	56%	7%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	58%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	61%	71%	-10%	55%	6%
	2018	52%	64%	-12%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	74%	76%	-2%	54%	20%
	2018	67%	70%	-3%	54%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
08	2019	67%	62%	5%	46%	21%
	2018	68%	60%	8%	45%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	63%	60%	3%	48%	15%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	50%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
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	69%	72%	-3%	71%	-2%
2018	77%	67%	10%	71%	6%
Compare		-8%			

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	99%	74%	25%	61%	38%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	77%	23%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	59%	-59%	56%	-56%

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	23	33	24	31	44	45	40	24	8		
ELL		30			50						
ASN	80	69		87	62						
BLK	35	39	34	55	61	61	45	68			
HSP	50	51	40	67	65	67	41	62			
MUL	57	34	50	72	66	64	62	85			
WHT	62	56	40	72	65	57	68	71	49		
FRL	48	47	38	62	59	54	55	59	33		

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	17	37	37	29	44	38	21	41			
ELL		43	55	33	36	36					
ASN	80	64		80	55						
BLK	51	49	39	45	49	38	39	45	36		
HSP	46	60	71	66	56	50	36	80	18		
MUL	60	54	40	65	47	60	50	62			
WHT	60	53	43	66	59	48	60	74	34		
FRL	48	51	46	54	52	41	46	63	26		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
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	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	55
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	61
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	60
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	51
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

Our SWD and ELL subgroup performed the lowest based on our 2018-2019 FSA results. Scheduling and clear expectations in regards to effective " gap instruction" were the primary barrier for YMS last year. However, our scores did reflect a 6% improvement from the previous year.

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

Our greatest decline was our our Black subgroup with a 16% decrease in reading high achievement. Time was a critical issue as teachers did not have sufficient time to hit the complexity level of the standards. In addition, supplemental resources were limited for teachers.

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

All grades 6-8 performed higher than the state average in both reading and math. However, our Civics EOC was 1% below the state's average. Resources and time have been a barrier for Yulee Middle School.

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

Our percentage of 6th graders performing at or above grade level improved by 7% from the previous year. We contribute our success to planning more collaboratively within our grade level as well as teachers implementing lessons that consistently reflects the complexity of the standards.

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

One or more suspensions in 7th grade for the 2019-2020 school year, with 18 students having one or more suspensions. Currently for this cohort as 8th graders, there are 10 students with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Professional Development and support for our new Math and ELA teachers.
2. Meeting the academic needs of our students.
3. Meeting the social emotional needs of our students.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

YMS 2018-2019 FSA Reading data in reading for 6th and 7th grade was below 60%. Our 7th grade students have performed below 60% for the last 5 years as a whole.

Measureable Outcome:

This year in 6th, 7th and 8th (intensive classes) grades we have a 90 minute instructional block with emphasis on a small group model. This model has proven to be effective and provides teachers with the opportunity to meet with students daily in a small group. The approach enables teachers to hone in on students' deficiencies with fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will be using Ready books during whole group instruction, selecting anchor text that aligns more to the complexity of the standard(s), and using small groups to differentiate instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The complexity level of text in the Ready book aligns closer to the text students will be exposed to during state testing. Intentionally selecting resources that correlate closer to the standards provides teachers with the best opportunity to assist their students in maximizing their potential. Based on data from the past 5 years, it is evident changes needed to be made.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Longer Instructional block in ELA/Reading.
2. Implementation of iReady Diagnostic for Level 1's and 2's.
3. Increased time for ESE teacher in ELA block.
4. Data from STAR, iReady, Leveled Literacy Intervention to prescribe differentiated instruction.
5. Professional Development for ESE and ELA teachers.

Person Responsible

George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For one year, our ESE population has performed below 41% (30% performance level).

Measureable Outcome: 42% percent of our ESE population will score at or above a level 3.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing data to provide prescribed gap instruction. ESE teachers scheduled to be in class with ESE students for 45 minutes each day to provide services to students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In the past year, our ESE population has performed below expectations. Reviewing schedules and observations determined a change was essential.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategically scheduling ESE teachers
2. Professional Development
3. Specific expectations in regards to planning and classroom responsibilities.

Person Responsible George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Over the past year, our ELL subgroup has performed below 41% (40% performance level).

Measurable Outcome: 42% of our ELL students will perform at or above a level 3 on the FSA ELA assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing data from WIDA and/or the IPT assessment, the ELA teacher will implement the LEP Plan and deliver individualized instruction to the ELL students that will help improve the students understanding and use of the English language.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: For the past year, ELL students have performed below expectations. Providing instruction that helps students diminish the language barrier will allow the ELL students to understand the English language text and instruction. As a result, ELL student performance levels will improve.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Strategically scheduling ELL students with ESOL certified teachers.
2. Specific expectations in regards to planning and classroom responsibilities.
3. Utilizing the district ESOL support personnel for professional development.

Person Responsible George Raysor (george.raysor@nassau.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The remaining school-wide improvement priorities identified in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/Analysis for Yulee Middle School (YMS):

- 1. Professional Development and support for our new Math and ELA teachers. At YMS, we foster a New Teacher Program facilitated by both Assistant Principals. During this program the Assistant Principals conduct a book study throughout the school year over eight sessions. The book review is over "What Great Teachers Do Differently." New teachers are also assigned a mentor to help them with the school and district classroom procedures. Many of the mentors are part of the school leadership team and provide support throughout.**
- 2. Meeting the academic needs of students. At YMS, we deliver instruction based on a data analysis approach to learning. After the baseline assessment data has been complete, the school leadership team will assist in identifying low performing students target their area of need. Targeted students are then provided support to bridge the gap from a systematic, Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) at YMS. Students are provided interventions based off of their targeted area of need and are progress monitored to determine the effectiveness of those interventions to help close the learning gap.**
- 3. Meeting the social emotional needs of our students. YMS focuses on building student relationships to improve student performance. The school leadership team provides support to teachers and students to help embrace the philosophy that every student can succeed in an emotionally safe learning environment where they feel accepted. Teachers form positive teacher-student relationships resulting in higher academic engagement, a decrease in absenteeism, and fewer disruptive behaviors in the classroom. Students are provided resources and guidance from teachers, school counselors, and school social workers to assist in the development of social skills. Students find acceptance within their classrooms and peer groups, as well as a sense of belonging and encouragement from their teacher. As a result, student performance increases.**

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.

*Yulee Middle School (YMS) offers a variety of communication formats to all stakeholders including: Facebook, updated school website, Remind, School Reach, and FOCUS (parent/

teacher/student portal for the reporting of grades, attendance, and data).

*YMS utilizes the school marquee for notification of upcoming events.

*YMS employs two school counselors and one social worker who collaborate daily and work cohesively to promote positive mental health among the students, faculty, and staff. The School Leadership Team works with the faculty and staff to promote positive teacher-student relationships.

*YMS employs a Positive Behavior Program within their school by providing incentives for students to help motivate their overall academic and behavior performance.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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