Manatee County Public Schools

Florine J Abel Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

https://www.manateeschools.net/abel

Demographics

Principal: Samantha Webb

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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.

Table of Contents

Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

https://www.manateeschools.net/abel

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://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.

The mission of Florine J.Abel Elementary school is to provide an academic environment for our students, families, faculty and staff. Our intentions are to create a safe and loving center for us to share skills and concepts which will help each of us to live more positive and productive lives. Our goals include efforts to implement a student centered, standards based curriculum which will include use of text structure to build comprehension and writing skills, acceleration of student learning, fidelity to programs and ongoing student engagement in the lessons. A continued emphasis for the 19-20 school year is to help teachers with full implementation of well written lesson plans to include more small group instruction which will be uploaded to our online classroom tool of Schoology.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Florine J. Abel Elementary school is to strive for the highest possible achievement for student success. We are united around the proposition of community and family engagement. We foster a culture of positive collaboration to support one another. We raise our expectations for everyone. We value acceleration of student learning, student engagement, fidelity to programs and standards based lesson planning to help students' comprehension using text structures and writing skills.

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
Webb, Samantha	Principal	Facilitate the development of school wide achievement goals, professional development and collaborative planning opportunities to meet goals and monitoring and adjustment of goals/strategies to ultimately increase student achievement.
Britto, Rebecca	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Samantha Webb

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (43%) 2015-16: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Friday 8/14/2020

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	69	82	67	82	86	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	10	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	5	8	5	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	27	11	18	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	6	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	6	0	0	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	69	82	67	82	86	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	469
Attendance below 90 percent	7	14	10	7	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	5	8	5	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA or Math	5	27	11	18	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	2	6	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	6	0	0	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	41%	52%	57%	43%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	57%	58%	51%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	55%	53%	41%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	63%	63%	47%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	68%	62%	57%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	53%	51%	36%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	48%	53%	29%	42%	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	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	57%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	56%	-12%	58%	-14%
	2018	33%	51%	-18%	56%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	38%	52%	-14%	56%	-18%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
	2018	46%	56%	-10%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	65%	-2%	64%	-1%
	2018	41%	61%	-20%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	49%	-14%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	17	59	63	39	86	78	25				
ELL	38	43	53	56	72	45	32				
BLK	34	45	36	46	58						
HSP	39	50	61	57	75	67	25				
MUL	53	50		79	60						
WHT	47	56	50	64	79	62	57				
FRL	36	48	59	54	70	68	36				
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	19	30	35	20	38	38	10				
ELL	29	46	44	42	55	44	12				
BLK	27	39	42	38	66	55	31				
HSP	38	49	42	52	61	42	32				
MUL	47	64		47	55						
WHT	50	41	9	53	47	20	52				
FRL	37	45	41	45	56	37	33				
2017 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	8	31	31	17	29	23	5				
ELL	21	37	30	40	49	33					
BLK	34	43		41	52						
HSP	39	49	41	48	59	36	38				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	52	62	47	49	56	31	14				
FRL	38	48	38	43	56	40	24				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
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	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	426
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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
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	44
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	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
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
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	59
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	52
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.

Data component with the lowest performance is ELA proficiency across grades 3-5, especially compared to the district level which is performing 12-14% below in each grade level. Contributing factors to 18.19's school data include a large number of students reading below grade level indicated by iReady ELA diagnostics and DIBELS ORF assessments.

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

Greatest decline was in 5th grade ELA, which declined by 3% from the year prior. However, the cohort did increase by 3%. Factors that contribute to the decline are that the cohort scored significantly lower the year prior.

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.

Data component with the greatest gap compared to the state average is 3rd grade ELA with a gap of 19% followed by 5th grade ELA with a gap of 18%. Factors that contribute to the gap are a significant amount of students reading below grade level as measured by iREADY ELA diagnostics and DIBELS ORF assessments.

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 4th grade math with an improvement of 19% from in one year comparable to the state. Actions that school took to achieve this improvement was through the inclusion of math spiral review and acceleration through "Acaletics."

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

An area of concern in ELA proficiency for grades 3-5 and learning gains for the lowest quartile for ELA and Math.

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

1. ELA Proficiency for grades 3-5
2. ELA Learning Gains for grades 4 & 5
3. ELA Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile grades 4 & 5
4. Math Learning Gains for grades 4 & 5
5. Math Learning Gains for Lowest Quartile grades 4 & 5

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	One area of focus is providing small group differentiation for students in both ELA and Math. Small group differentiation provides remediation for students to close reading and/or math gaps and be provided with additional scaffolding techniques. Differentiation also provides acceleration for students that are meeting or exceeding proficiency. In order for us to make gains in proficiency for reading and math as well as increase learning gains, small group differentiation for students is necessary.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency will increase by 5% per grade level as measured by the FSA. Math proficiency will increase to 65% across grades as measured by the FSA. Learning Gains for both Math and ELA will increase to 85% across grades as measured by the FSA. Learning Gains for the Lowest Quartile will increase to 85% across grade as measured by the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group differentiation Remediation Acceleration
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	After student data analysis across grade levels, it was evident that classrooms had a variety of student learning levels and learning needs. In order to close achievement gaps for students and provide acceleration opportunities, the need to differentiate instruction was concluded. Data was used from 18.19 FSA scores and district scores (iReady, Quarterly Benchmarks) to determine the need to increase student achievement and select the instructional strategy to best meet the learning needs of our students.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify student learning needs using previous data points (FSA scores, district quarterly benchmark scores, iReady diagnostic scores)
Identify opportunities for differentiation for ELA and Math (close reading strategies, reciprocal reading strategies, Math Acaletics, Math spiral review)
Identify and select additional highly effective staff to assist in providing differentiation opportunities
Select materials to provide differentiation materials that align to standards
Monitor the progress of the differentiation groups through student learning gain scale scores

Person Responsible	Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Another area of focus is increasing student engagement to impact student achievement through proficiency and learning gains. Student engagement was identified as a critical need based on ELA proficiency and learning gains scores, since the scores were significantly lower in these areas compared across the school and compared to district ELA scores. Ultimately, increasing student engagement will lead to increased student learning and mastery of core standards.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA scores will increase by 5% across grades 3-5 as measured by the FSA. ELA learning gains will increase to 85% as measured by the FSA. ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile will increase by 85% as measured by the FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of Thinking Maps
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Thinking maps increases comprehension, provides explicit vocabulary instruction, provides concrete representation for core ELA standards and provides writing support.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development on Thinking Maps for staff
Provide ongoing coaching opportunities for Thinking Maps and how to use
Collaboratively plan with grade level teams on the selection and implementation of Thinking Maps for ELA, Science and Math.

Person Responsible	Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will begin implementation of the high effect size practice of "student reported grades" where students begin monitoring their grades based on individual learning gains. Learning gains for students will be monitored and students will take part in learning gains celebrations. Monthly Data Chats with grade level teams will look at learning gains of students, followed by collaborative planning addressing how to increase learning gains using different differentiation strategies and engagement techniques.

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 begin by building a positive culture and environment through shared development of common core values and achievement goals with our school staff and students. Shared core values include prioritizing community, professionalism, and positivity. Development of shared achievement goals include 5% increase for ELA proficiency, 65% math proficiency, and 85% learning gains. Students take ownership in a positive culture and environment though shared achievement goals, "100% Learning Gains," and using monthly character traits (Character Strong) to reinforce school wide goals. We have created monthly "Learning Gains" celebrations for students to acknowledge and celebrate when students meet their specific learning gain goals for reading, math or science.

We include our families to assist in the development of a positive school culture through consistent parent/family communication. This includes weekly Connect Ed messages and using Abel's Class DOJO. Parents are informed of upcoming events, how to access their child's grades and opportunities to come discuss their child's progress with the school at any time. We also communicate with parents their child's learning gains and celebrate student successes across the school level.

This year we have diligently focused on developing our school wide community and business partners to help us building our school community. Community partnerships have a clear understanding of our school wide goals to increase student achievement and assist in providing school supplies for our students. In addition, our community partners have donated essential items such as food and clothing for our most fragile students whose families are facing financial difficulties.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00