Apollo Beach Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Apollo Beach Elementary School

501 APOLLO BEACH BLVD, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Mcmillan

Start Date for this Principal: 4/22/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	42%
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 (60%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Hillsborough 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

Apollo Beach Elementary School

501 APOLLO BEACH BLVD, Apollo Beach, FL 33572

[no web address on file]

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 KG-5	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.

Achieve Goals
Build connections
Engage Hearts and Minds
Support growth

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Students for Life

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
McMillan, Kelly	Principal	Instructional Leadership Team meetings can include the following: Principal Assistant Principal School Counselor Academic Coaches (Reading) Grades K-5 team leaders ESE representative AGP representative Specialists team representative The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) meets monthly. The purpose of the ILT is to: 1. Collaborate and problem solve to ensure the implementation of highly functioning and effective Professional Learning Communities (PLC). 2. Support the implementation of high quality core instruction and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3). 3. Review ongoing progress monitoring data at the core to ensure fidelity of instruction and attainment of SIP goal(s) in curricular, behavioral, and attendance domains. 4. Communicate school-wide data to PLCs and facilitate problem solving within the content/grade level teams. Our Problem Solving Leadership Team (PSLT) includes the following individuals: Principal and/or Assistant Principal School Counselor School Psychologist School Social Worker (when needed) ESE representative Academic coach (reading) Teacher(s),as identified by student need PSLT meets weekly. The purpose of PSLT is to: 1. Monitor quality instructional practices utilizing the RtI/MTSS process: at the core (Tier 1) and intervention/enrichment (Tiers 2/3) levels. 2. Monitor progress of students identified in Tiers 2/3 as measured by specific interventions/progress monitoring tools. 3. Problem solve interventions and provide systems of support to meet needs of individual students with academic and/or behavioral needs. A collaborative culture of shared responsibility is established through ILT, PSLT, and PLCs. Research consistently bears out that the school leader is the most important element in teachers choosing to go to, and then remain at, a school site. To that end, HCPS works to ensure that principals are selected and placed with great care. HCPS works to develop strong leaders through the Hillsborough Principal Pipeline. As stated above, The Hillsborough Principal Pipeline offers unique and valuable opportunities for teachers to experience and prepare for a school leadership position by helping them gain the skills, experience and confidence that are crucial to becoming a high-performing leader. Pursuing school leadership

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		provides the opportunity to make a direct impact on school culture and positively influence instructional quality, which will result in improved outcomes and higher long-term success rates for students in Hillsborough County.

HCPS' vision for instructional improvement is to have a highly effective teacher in every classroom and a highly effective principal in every school. This vision is founded in the research-based tenet that teacher quality has a larger impact on student achievement than any other schooling factor. Further research demonstrates the impact of a principal's leadership on outcomes for students and teachers. Over the past decade, HCPS has developed a Human Capital Management System (HCMS) to further the district's vision of instructional improvement.

Several Teacher Interview Days and Recruitment Fairs occur throughout the summer months, under the oversight of Human Resources. All applicants must be pre-approved by the District to attend these events. Certified teachers with an Effective or Highly Effective performance evaluation, teaching in field, at our highest needs schools are eligible for salary differential. This program was established with the purpose of helping to create stability and equity in harder to staff schools, recruiting and retaining highly qualified instructional staff, increasing student achievement, and promoting a culture of ongoing professional development.

Educator effectiveness ratings that differentiate educator quality are used to assist principals in determining teachers' transfer options and promotion into leadership positions. HCPS has linked PD opportunities to HR functions so that school-level and district-level trainings are developed and deployed in response to areas of need identified by educator evaluations. Training course completions can also be tracked by HR Partners to inform human capital decisions. |
| Fuller, Bradley | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 4/22/2015, Kelly Mcmillan

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	42%
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 (60%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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	116	103	108	110	109	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	654
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	6	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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
Wednesday 6/24/2020

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	110	104	104	109	105	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	13	7	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	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	

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	110	104	104	109	105	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	641
Attendance below 90 percent	7	10	13	7	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	69%	52%	57%	68%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	58%	53%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	50%	53%	20%	51%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	54%	63%	77%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	57%	62%	71%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	46%	51%	55%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	50%	53%	73%	48%	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	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%	
	2018	77%	53%	24%	57%	20%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	68%	55%	13%	58%	10%	
	2018	64%	55%	9%	56%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		-9%					
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%	
	2018	60%	51%	9%	55%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		0%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					

MATH							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
03	2019	74%	54%	20%	62%	12%	
	2018	86%	55%	31%	62%	24%	
Same Grade Comparison		-12%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	80%	57%	23%	64%	16%	
	2018	79%	57%	22%	62%	17%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison		-6%					
05	2019	68%	54%	14%	60%	8%	
	2018	82%	54%	28%	61%	21%	
Same Grade Comparison		-14%					
Cohort Comparison		-11%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**	
05	2019	65%	51%	14%	53%	12%	

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	52%	28%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison	-15%					
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	33	26	31	43	61	56	25				
ELL	38	42		52	58						
BLK	57			62							
HSP	52	44	45	61	66	55	31				
MUL	93			73							
WHT	74	54	44	80	67	43	78				
FRL	54	45	46	55	61	37	27				

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	27	31	27	60	75	60	39				
ELL	23	47	50	54	68	40	36				
BLK	67			75							
HSP	49	52	40	69	73	58	69				
WHT	72	59	32	89	80	65	86				
FRL	53	51	30	72	76	63	67				

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	22	16	9	45	45	39	29				
ELL	19	32	36	52	47						
BLK	60			80							
HSP	41	38	17	63	60	45	57				
WHT	75	57	23	82	76	61	77				
FRL	47	38	16	60	60	50	56				

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	63

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	506
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	55
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	60
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	83
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	63
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.

Overall reading gains and bottom quartile reading gains are still below the state and district. Students with disabilities subgroup is only at 33% proficient and learning gains at 26%. Also, our math bottom quartile is at the same level as the state and barely above the district average which is a decrease from previous year. Our bottom quartile gains and SWD performance continue to be our lowest performing groups. Changes have been made to teachers who are working with our students in these subgroups. We need to focus on responding and differentiating for the needs of diverse learners in all subjects.

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

Science had the greatest decline with a 16 point drop. The factor that we contributed to the decline was less time for science intervention groups.

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 bottom quartile learning gains has the greatest gap when compared to the state. This is a continuing trend at our school. After reflection and root cause analysis, we believe that teachers may be lacking the knowledge and resources to adequately support the individual needs of diverse learners.Additionally, writing could be a possible factor in the historical decrease between 3rd and 4th/5th grades.

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

ELA bottom quartile also showed the most improvement by an increase of 11 points. We have focused on planning around standards, identifying essential and supporting standards to maximize instructional time.

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

Attendance is a potential area of concern as reflected on our EWS data

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

1. Feedback to students
2. Formative assessment to drive instruction
3. Appropriate and effective interventions when a student is struggling to master standards
4. Student motivation/SEL

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Historically, we have multiple subgroups who lack gains in learning from year to year based on a variety of data, including, but not limited to state standardized tests. It is imperative that we increase these learning gains for all students, including those identified in subgroups. By focusing on assessment and feedback to students, we will be able to better determine the needs of individual learners and how to target supports to help them master standards. Our work with assessment and feedback to students will include developing and extending our knowledge and application in data analysis, formative assessment, planning driven by formative assessments to differentiate for a variety of needs, using common assessment to progress monitor, and goal setting with students.
Measurable Outcome:	In the spring of 2021, student learning gains for all students, including each subgroup, will increase by 10 percentage points, as evidenced by FSA for ELA and Mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly McMillan (kelly.mcmillan@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative assessment Common assessments Student goal setting
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	John Hattie's visible learning research provides a rationale for strengthening the specific strategies that we are focusing on this year. The effect size for collective teacher efficacy is +1.57, interventions for students with learning needs is +.77, feedback to students is +.7, and goals +.68.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Preplanning action planning (admin/staff)
2. Professional Development (admin/reading academic coach/district resources)
3. Utilizing ILT and the data team to support implementation (Principal/AP/teacher leaders)
4. Monitoring student data (ILT, SAC, PLCs)

Person Responsible	Kelly McMillan (kelly.mcmillan@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

See the focus under Positive Culture and Environment

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.

In order to ensure the social and emotional well-being of our students, we will continue to focus on character development and social emotional learning. Using our National School of Character feedback, our staff will focus on adjusting practices to better support the social-emotional needs of students. Principle #7 of the 11 Principles of Character is Student Motivation. This is the one area of focus provided to us by the National School of Character evaluation. The feedback focused on moving toward developing students intrinsic motivation versus providing incentives for behavior and character. This year we will continue to focus on the following in regard to Principle #7:
1. Continue our ABES Familye meetings every month
3. Meet with student chat and chew groups for grades 3-5 to include students in discussions about what is going well, how adults can better support students, and next steps.
4. Staff participation in PD about self awareness and bias.
5. Staff participation in PD about social emotional learning.
5. Class meeting time built into daily schedule.
6. Staff participation in PD about class meetings.
6. Continue making adjustments with classroom behavior plans that move away from incentive-based motivators.
7. Use the ABES matrix chart in common areas and engage students in creating one around classroom expectations in each class. This will align behavior expectations with character core values.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00