

Manatee County Public Schools

Virgil Mills Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Virgil Mills Elementary School

7200 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/mills>

Demographics

Principal: Jim Mennes

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2015

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)	45%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Virgil Mills Elementary School

7200 69TH ST E, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.manateeschools.net/mills>

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	No	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

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.

To implement a student-centered, standards-based, rigorous teaching and learning process that will positively impact all student learning of the Florida Standards: to ensure the success of all students on state assessments, the next grade level, prepared for graduation and college/career readiness.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Virgil Mills Elementary is a school where staff members value children and make learning a high priority. Students experience a high engagement learning environment where teachers use meaningful content. Students achieve mastery, reason, make judgments, think critically. and acquire and evaluate new information.

Teachers know the individual learning styles and interests of their students. Progress monitoring is implemented to ensure the academic growth of each child. Through 21st century technology, students experience an individualized curriculum and a broader range of resources that motivate them to obtain higher levels of achievement.

Children's diverse backgrounds, cultures and achievements are valued and respected. Students are challenged to excel in a threat free learning environment. They learn and implement the principles of truthfulness, trustworthiness, active listening, no put-downs, and personal best.

Staff members build rapport and trust with each other, our parents, community members, and most importantly our students. The school recognizes and values the role that parents play in their children's education. Together the entire school community inspires a love of learning that helps each child reach his/her goals.

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
Mennes, James	Principal	The school leadership team makes decisions based on data to assure quality, research based instructional practices are met in every classroom. Instructional support includes but is not limited to model lessons, standards based planning, use of high engagement practice with focus on cooperative structures, and one on one support for any needs for the grade level assigned to the (AST) Administrative Support team member. The school leadership team serves as the (ILT) Instructional Leadership Team where the team analyzes data to meet the needs of the school community. In addition, the Leadership Collaborative Team (TST) meets monthly to set SMART goals and create buy-in for platoon partnerships to have a common goal mindset. SMART goals are reviewed monthly to assure the progress towards a goal is being met. Upon analyzing a goal, the progress toward the goal is reviewed by the team to assure additional barriers are addressed to for academic success of every individual in our school.
Bovoletis, Alik	Assistant Principal	School Leaders

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/26/2015, Jim Mennes

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.*

42

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

62

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)	45%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	114	132	140	148	176	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	870
Attendance below 90 percent	11	6	3	11	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	8	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Monday 8/31/2020

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	113	132	142	149	177	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	875
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	5	7	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	0	0	0	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		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	113	132	142	149	177	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	875
Attendance below 90 percent	8	7	5	7	12	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	1	0	0	0	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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		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%	66%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	57%	58%	62%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	55%	53%	46%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	63%	63%	69%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	68%	62%	63%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	53%	51%	50%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	48%	53%	54%	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	70%	51%	19%	58%	12%
	2018	63%	49%	14%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	56%	13%	58%	11%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	56%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	65%	52%	13%	56%	9%
	2018	62%	52%	10%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	60%	14%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	60%	56%	4%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	65%	11%	64%	12%
	2018	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	65%	60%	5%	60%	5%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	58%	48%	10%	53%	5%
	2018	66%	49%	17%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
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	37	48	45	42	55	50	27				
ELL	38	50	41	35	50	42	30				
ASN	78	79		83	86						
BLK	57	68	45	52	61	33	59				
HSP	56	57	48	58	52	39	43				
MUL	70	57		70	77		65				
WHT	74	68	43	79	76	63	65				
FRL	55	57	42	59	59	43	45				

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	40	30	27	39	30	15				
ELL	35	59	45	40	50	20	46				
ASN	71			71							
BLK	54	54	30	54	51		57				
HSP	49	58	50	54	56	38	30				
MUL	62	54		70	60		67				
WHT	76	59	37	77	59	43	79				

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
FRL	55	55	38	58	55	35	55				
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	31	53	42	36	61	54	9				
ELL	41	48	41	40	57	55	17				
ASN	58			83							
BLK	57	54	45	59	61	43	46				
HSP	54	51	40	54	53	49	48				
MUL	55	59		59	50						
WHT	73	67	51	76	67	49	61				
FRL	54	60	48	58	59	53	47				

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	62
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	499
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	44
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	82
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	54
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	52
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	68
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	67
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	54
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.

ELA and Math Learning Gains of our Lowest 25% was our lowest performance area with overall gains of 45% for ELA and 50% for Math. (ELA 5% gain and Math 13% gain). The Lowest Quartile Gains is still our biggest area of need. Training in conducting targeted guided small group individualized lessons to meet student needs is essential. This was not happening across the board and will be a focus for this school year.

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

In our school data, all areas showed an increase over the prior year except Science Achievement, which decreased by 7%. 2018 proficiency was 66% and 2019 was 59%. Schedules are tight with added PE time and there is not enough dedicated science teaching time. Part of the reason for the decline is the nature of the class that was our 5th graders last year. This class had a higher percentage of SWD and behavior needs. Our district-provided science text was too general. The nature of science texts is that the reading level is above grade level, so comprehension of processes and concepts are not easily reinforced through the text.

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.

Virgil Mills school data components were all above the state average except our Math gains of the Lowest 25%. Our percentage of students who made gains in this Lowest 25 percentile category was 50% and the state percentage was 51%. We attribute part of this issue to the breadth of what needs to be taught to stay with the district curriculum plan and the amount of time pulled from learning these days to accommodate more Physical Education/activity each day.

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

Third grade data for both ELA and Math showed excellent improvement over the 2018 data. ELA rose from 63% proficiency to 70% and Math rose from 60% in 2018 to 74% in 2019; Math being the most improved. We attribute this partly to our lack of a mandatory math textbook since this was a gap year. So our leadership and staff researched options and chose resources that we felt fit our student need and staff expertise. District funded some of the requests for these materials.

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

Focus is used to formally monitor attendance, discipline and achievement. Teacher meetings and calls for assistance are also used to discuss classroom concerns related to these areas to identify students who exhibit Warning Signs and students who exhibit more than one. At this point in the year, Behavior is a concern because we have a few students who are exhibiting tier 2 or 3 behavior and this impacts the learning and culture

whole classes. The numbers kids who are on watch and receiving assistance from Support Specialists, Counselors, and Administration (who make up the support team) are:

K- 2

1st-6

2nd-4

3rd-5

4th-4

5th-0

Each student on this list is monitored and has an informal classroom plan that is shared between the support team and the teacher. If these plans do not yield appropriate behavior, a formal behavior plan will be created.

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

1. Reading intervention groups designed to meet student needs are done with fidelity, utilizing all levels of teams for guidance in strategies to meet deficits: TCT grade level teams, AST admin leadership and ILT school teacher leaders, MTSS problem solving team.
2. Though we have seen an increase in the percentage of our ELA lowest 25th who are making gains, it is still our lowest area with only 45% of our L25 making gains.
3. Our Math Lowest 25th percentile is at 50% which is a huge gain over 2018 which was at 37%. We are still below the district and state averages, so this area is also a priority improvement area.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Area of Focus comes from the data from FSA 18/19, the Fall Diagnostic 2020, i-Ready, which was just completed, and district data identifying our L25 in each classroom. Using our daily team intervention time with certified teacher-support staff pushing in to help meet learning needs of these student's daily. We are using resources that are research based,explicit, systematic and multi-sensory. These resources are chosen by administration from an instructional materials list approved by our district along with training for teachers.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2020-21 School Year, there will be a 10% increase in learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile of students taking the 2020-2021 FSA ELA assessment over these scored in the 2018-2019 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Aliko Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Jan Richardson, The Next Step Forward In Guided Reading
Literacy FootPrints
LLI

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Using assessment to identify a students strengths and needs has a tremendous value when used to make instructional decisions. From the information provided teachers can form flexible, needs based groups that differentiate instruction in a specific way. When students have instruction that is tailored to their specific needs, they show the most gains measured by progress monitoring. When the student has mastered the skill they can work on another area of need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify student needs using reading asseements and i-Ready data
2. Grade level data meetings to establish student groups and identifying teachers for each group.
3. Monthly grade level data meetings to discuss student movement and progress monitoring to analyze student data and work samples.
4. Each Sementer there will be a grade lelvel collaboration day used to plan for differentiated small group instruction.

Person Responsible Aliko Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Our ELA and Math Learning Gains of our Lowest 25% is our lowest performance area with 3rd-5th overall gains of 45% for ELA and 50% for Math. Both showed good improvement over the prior year, (ELA 5% gain and Math 13% gain) but the Lowest Quartile Gains is still our biggest area of need. We attribute some of the problems to not having enough intervention resources and training to accommodate the numbers at our school. Training in conducting guided small group individualized lessons to meet student needs is essential. This was not happening across the board and will be a focus for this school year.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, there will be a 10% increase in learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile of students taking the 2020-2021 FSA Math assessment over those scored in the 2018-2019 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Small group differentiated instruction
IXL
Acaletics(4th & 5th)
i-Ready

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Using assessment to identify a students strength's and needs has a tremendous value when used to make instructional decisions. From the information provided teachers can form flexible, needs based groups that differentiate instruction in a specific way. When students have instruction that is tailored to their specific needs, they show the most gains measured by progress monitoring. When the student has mastered the skill they can work on another area of need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify student needs using reading asseements and i-Ready data
2. Grade level data meetings to establish student groups and identifying teachers for each group.
3. Monthly grade level data meetings to discuss student movement and progress monitoring to analyze student data and work samples.
4. Each Sementer there will be a grade lelvel collaboration day used to plan for differentiated small group instruction.

Person Responsible

James Mennes (mennesj@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 19-20 Quarter 1 4th grade average was a 4.5 out of 10 and 5th grade average was a 5.9 out of 10. Writing is the lowest subject areas across the school and has not made much growth. Writing increases the depth of knowledge and higher order thinking and can be integrated into all subject areas.

Measurable Outcome: Through the implementations of Writing Cross-Content, the 4th grade average will increase to 5.5 by the end of the 2020-21 school year measured by Write Score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Aliko Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students use evidence based writing to justify thier thinking in all subject areas. By interconnecting writing into math, science and social studies student students will develop a deeper understand of the concepts and demonstrate higher order thinking.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teaching Reading & Writing : Improving Instruction and Student Acheivement by: Brett Miller & Peggy Mc Cardle.
Being a writer in k-3
Reading, Writing Project in 4-5.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Evidence of writing in Lesson plans
2. Using Being a writer in k-3 and Reading, Writing Project in 4-5.
3. Discussing writing in data meetings.
4. Providing mini professional development for writing cross content areas.

Person Responsible Aliko Bovoletis (bovoletisa@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 and the school counselor will be leading a new Character Counts program to help with discipline, which directly impacts our Tier 2/3 students achievement and growth.

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.

- Character Strong
- PTO/SAC
- Spirt Nights at Restruants
- Friday Spirt Days
- Churches, and community out reach
- Community Garden Parties
- Business Partner Lunches /Snacks
- Sunshine Committty
- Drive through open house
- Take Home STEM Activities

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: ELA				\$1,300.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3410	140-Substitute Teachers	0791 - Virgil Mills Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,300.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$12,075.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	3410	239-Other	0791 - Virgil Mills Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$12,075.00
			<i>Notes: IXL</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
					Total:	\$13,375.00