Desoto Trail Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Desoto Trail Elementary School

5200 TREDINGTON PARK DR, Tallahassee, FL 32309

https://www.leonschools.net/desototrail

Demographics

Principal: Michele Keltner   Start Date for this Principal: 5/26/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Leon 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.

To Challenge Each Student to Blaze a Successful Trail To the Future!

Provide the school's vision statement.

DeSoto Trail Elementary will be an engaging, safe and respectful learning environment that embraces change and produces successful learners who value diversity and are conscientious contributors to our society.

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
Keltner, Michele	Principal	School-wide responsibilities
Poole, Cassandra	Assistant Principal	School-wide responsibilities
Schubert, David	Instructional Technology	Oversee the technology component of school wide schedules and systems
Lambert, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and kindergarten team
Chrisinger, Barbara	Instructional Media	Oversee reading/literacy program
Morris, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and fourth grade team
Whitney, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and fifth grade team
Daugherty, Robert	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and special area team
Kolke, Margaret	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and third grade team
Childers, Janet	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and first grade team
Dillon, Kelli	Teacher, K-12	Liaison between administration and second grade team
Marti, Peter	Teacher, ESE	Liaison between administration and ESE team

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 5/26/2020, Michele Keltner

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.*

4

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (76%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest

Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
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	104	112	129	110	97	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	643
Attendance below 90 percent	9	13	12	17	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	4	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/28/2020

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	117	134	118	101	97	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	7	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	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	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	117	134	118	101	97	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	11	14	7	9	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	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	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	83%	57%	57%	86%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	54%	58%	69%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	47%	53%	72%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	83%	64%	63%	88%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	63%	62%	80%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	51%	75%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	74%	52%	53%	88%	51%	51%

	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	91%	61%	30%	58%	33%
	2018	85%	61%	24%	57%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	57%	22%	58%	21%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	56%	20%
	2018	83%	57%	26%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

			MATH				
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	84%	63%	21%	62%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	84%	64%	20%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	66%	13%	64%	15%
	2018	89%	62%	27%	62%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	81%	61%	20%	60%	21%
	2018	91%	58%	33%	61%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	54%	18%	53%	19%
	2018	85%	56%	29%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	64	63		69	67		69				
ASN	93	55		93	91						
BLK	66	65	40	63	52	45	41				
HSP	73			87							
WHT	85	71	61	84	74	50	82				
FRL	70	64	47	68	61	44	48				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	63	59		76	67						
ELL	75	60		75	80						
ASN	100	92		94	92						
BLK	59	41	38	65	54	36					
HSP	85			77							
WHT	86	72	61	91	85	86	86				
FRL	63	60	42	71	69	62	68				

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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	65	48	50	65	48	55	67				
ELL	67			67							
ASN	89	80		89	90						
BLK	68	70	70	70	75		100				
HSP	91			91							
WHT	89	69	74	90	81	71	86				
FRL	72	70	71	80	83	76	94				

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	66
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
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	53
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	80
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	72
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	57
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.

Based on 2018-2019 FSA data and 2019-2020 Progress Monitoring data, our lowest performance was in the learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile of students category, for both ELA and Math. In both of these subjects, 52% of our students made a learning gain this year. These percentages are lower than the previous year, when 57% of our lowest quartile made a learning gain in ELA and 74% of our lowest quartile made a learning gain in Math. The biggest contributing factor this year was likely the change in the format of the test; we were very proactive about preparing our students for the format of the FSA when it was on the computer, and we need to use resources with our students that will prepare them better for the paper-based version of the FSA. The trend, however, reveals our need to make differentiated instruction and reading/math interventions an even bigger priority than it has been at our school.

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

Our greatest decline from the prior year was in the category of math learning gains for the lowest quartile of students. Last year, 74% of students in this category made a learning gain. This year, only 52% of these students made a learning gain. Last year's performance was an outlier in the positive direction, and this year we fell back to a more typical percentage of students meeting the mark. Although we are still above the state and district average for learning gains among our lowest quartile, by placing an extra focus on those students this year we are hoping to bring the score in this category up closer to where it was last year.

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.

ELA Achievement was the component with the greatest gap compared to the state average, at +26%. However, in the ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile category, our score is below the state average by 1%. Historically, we've typically outperformed the state average in every category. Dipping below the state average in this category again reinforces the need to place extra focus on our bottom quartile's learning gains this year.

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

Last year we had some of the highest scores we've ever had across all components. This year we did not improve in any individual component; we tied our score from last year in the ELA Achievement category. This across-the-board stagnation and decline is likely due to the change in the format of the FSA. This year, we will address this by providing students with opportunities to practice the new format throughout the year.

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

Our EWS numbers don't indicate any major areas of concern. We will continue to follow up with parents whenever a pattern of poor attendance occurs, and our increased focus on our lowest quartile is likely to improve the number of students earning a Level 1 on a state assessment.

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

1. Improve the percentage of our lowest quartile making a learning gain in Reading
2. Improve the percentage of our lowest quartile making a learning gain in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a whole, our students performed well on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA assessment and on progress monitoring assessments during the 2019-2020 school year. We consistently have a much higher percentage of students proficient on the FSA than the state or district averages. Our lowest quartile, however, makes learning gains at near the same rate as the state average. Our goal is to rise above the state average in this category, as we are in overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who make a learning gain in ELA by at least 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide research-based reading intervention programs such as Lexia and Read Naturally for teachers to use with low-performing students. Provide training for teachers in using these programs as well as intervention resources already available at the school, such as Six Minute Solutions and Reading Wonders intervention materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our district has vetted intervention programs to ensure they are research- based and evidence-based to be effective interventions

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers in the use of intervention programs

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Select students based on data from i-Ready Diagnostic and STAR Reading

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Implement interventions with students

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Monitor student progress in response to interventions

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As a whole, our students perform well on the FSA Math assessment and on progress monitoring assessments during the 2019-2020 school year. We consistently have a much higher percentage of students proficient on this FSA than the state or district averages. Our lowest quartile, however, makes learning gains at near the same rate as the state average. Our goal is to rise above the state average in this category, as we are in overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	To increase the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who make a learning gain in Math by at least 5%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use the i-Ready Diagnostic and STAR Math assessments to provide teachers with data on the areas where students have gaps in understanding of mathematics concepts, and structure instructional time to include small- group instruction during which teachers can differentiate math instruction to fill-in gaps in understanding by individualizing instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our district has provided assessments to identify students and selected curriculum materials that contain robust, evidence-based interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers in the use of intervention programs

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Select students based on data from i-Ready Diagnostic and STAR Reading

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Implement interventions with students

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Monitor student progress in response to interventions

Person Responsible	Michele Keltner (keltnerm@leonschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All Areas of Focus addressed in goals above.

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.

We are proud of how we build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of our students.
•Parental involvement opportunities exist throughout the school year, including parent/ teacher conferences, classroom volunteers, PTO meetings, Science Olympiad, field trips, and fundraisers;
•Curriculum nights inform parents about grade-specific course curriculum and provide answers to any questions parents may have. Further, to encourage parental attendance, the school is offering these informational sessions in the evenings;
•Soliciting feedback from parents regarding their comfort level in contacting teachers and administrators with questions or problems;
•During curriculum nights, ensure non-threatening methods of introducing parents to teachers and administrators;
•Offer fun, interactive tutorials to parents who are unfamiliar with FOCUS, listservs, and other forms of educational technology;
•Communicate classroom and school news to parents;
•Discuss effective strategies for conducting supportive and effective parent phone calls and face-to-face meetings;
•Positive notes, letters, phone calls, emails home;
•Share information about growth mindset, GRIT, and Sanford Harmony social emotional learning curriculum with parents at curriculum nights and PTO meetings.

The school meets the varying social-emotional needs of its individual students through a variety of programs and services. The Mentoring program pairs community volunteers with at-risk students who need encouragement, academic skills practice, or an adult they can trust and talk to. The guidance counselor holds mini-sessions to help small groups of students process emotions such as anger or grief. The Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) team brings together the school psychologist, social workers, behavioral specialists, teachers, parents, and other stakeholders to identify the social, emotional, and academic needs of students and pair them with appropriate interventions and other pupil services.

We are proud of how we support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.
-All members of the school staff participate in collaborative learning communities that meet both informally and formally on a regular schedule. Collaboration occurs across grade levels, content areas, and feeder schools. Staff members implement a formal process that promotes productive discussion about student learning. School personnel can clearly link collaboration to improvement results in instructional practice and student performance. -The school asks parents to complete the Pre-K Readiness Checklist as required by the district.
-The school provides tours to families of students entering the elementary program.
-Fifth graders are invited to a Curriculum Night at Montford Middle School in May to ease their transition to

sixth grade. The Montford Middle School guidance team also comes to the school each spring to meet with fifth grade students and answer their questions about transitioning to middle school.
-The school sends representatives to the Northeast Articulation Team (NEAT), the feeder pattern articulation committee, to inform students and families about school events and to motivate students to build a commitment to learning at all school levels.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00