Atwater Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Atwater Elementary

4701 HUNTSVILLE AVE, North Port, FL 34288

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/atwater

Demographics

Principal: Cynthia Thro

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2018

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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 Sarasota 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

Atwater Elementary

4701 HUNTSVILLE AVE, North Port, FL 34288

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/atwater

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	Yes	65%

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	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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 Atwater Elementary School is to equip our students and staff to achieve "All-Star" levels of success in teaching and learning through the use of collaboration, technology, family and community involvement, and differentiated instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Excellence in Academics and Character

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
Thro, Cynthia	Principal	The School Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss individual students and their progress towards mastery of the grade-level curriculum and any behavioral concerns. This multi-disciplinary team is responsible for aligning the needs of the students to the interventions and instruction needed. The members of the team meet with grade level teams to discuss students' progress. The Leadership Team is the overarching team that conducts ongoing progress monitoring of students' performance data when it is related to their interventions and academic/ behavioral progress. We also have a Student Support Team that assists with the implementation of the approved research-based intervention plans. We coordinate and implement our Title 1, Part A program to provide supplemental services to our families. In addition to using our funds to enhance after-school tutoring program materials, our Title 1 dollars are used to contract additional staff who provide our students with supplemental instruction. Our Parent Involvement funds are used to establish parent conference nights and provide parent training and family involvement events. Our school stresses ongoing professional development for our staff. As such, we use our professional development allocations to provide our staff with additional training in a number of areas that support student growth and achievement in all educational and social/emotional areas. Atwater continues the visible learning multi-year learning cycle this year including the focal points of analyzing teaching for student results and CHAMPs; creating a multi-layer approach to enhance and increase student achievement through collective efficacy and specific feedback.
Stonestreet, Vicki	School Counselor	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.
Coward, Sandee	Instructional Coach	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.
Steiner, Ami	Administrative Support	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.
Ramirez, Joy	Attendance/ Social Work	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.
Blashinsky, Christina	Instructional Coach	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.
Lamela, Marina	SAC Member	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.
Kisner, Jaime	Assistant Principal	Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/17/2018, Cynthia Thro

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.*
8

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.*
12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
44

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
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: A (68%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	99	95	90	104	99	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	4	6	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	2	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	3	0	0	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 9/21/2020

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	91	106	109	116	114	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	10	6	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	91	106	109	116	114	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	10	6	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	10	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	3	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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	68%	68%	57%	63%	68%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	62%	58%	58%	63%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	53%	53%	49%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	73%	63%	64%	72%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	67%	62%	69%	68%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	53%	51%	59%	57%	51%
Science Achievement	65%	65%	53%	67%	64%	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%	70%	0%	58%	12%
	2018	60%	68%	-8%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	67%	-3%	58%	6%
	2018	52%	67%	-15%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	68%	68%	0%	56%	12%
	2018	66%	66%	0%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	73%	5%	62%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	65%	72%	-7%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	72%	2%	64%	10%
	2018	54%	71%	-17%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	69%	70%	-1%	60%	9%
	2018	69%	72%	-3%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	65%	-1%	53%	11%
	2018	65%	67%	-2%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
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	27	50	64	50	65	52	14				
ELL	51	68	80	54	71	64	21				
BLK	62	77		60	70	54	62				
HSP	62	68	67	64	71	56	46				
MUL	64	81		71	71						
WHT	71	67	57	80	78	59	68				
FRL	64	68	64	73	75	56	62				
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	26	29	27	38	46	34	26				
ELL	38	50	40	35	42	19	40				
BLK	54	55		49	57	40	45				
HSP	57	54	46	61	57	44	72				
MUL	62	80		65							
WHT	64	59	46	68	66	49	66				
FRL	60	57	49	63	61	45	65				

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	23	40	40	22	52	53	27				
ELL	41	64	54	44	55						
BLK	63	48		50	65						
HSP	69	69	60	72	76		63				
MUL	47			59							
WHT	63	57	50	64	67	59	68				
FRL	61	57	49	61	68	58	65				

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	71
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	93
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	569
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	63
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	64
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	65
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	72
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	73
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	70
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 the data, the lowest component area was Science, showing a 2% decline from 2018 to 2019. Possible contributing factors include the decrease in scores from the SWD, ELL, Hispanic and FRL subgroups. It is believed this decline is due to the additional differentiated instruction and support these subgroups required in ELA and Math.

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

Based on the data, the component area with the greatest decline was Science, showing a 2% decrease from 2018 to 2019. Possible contributing factors include the decrease in scores from the SWD, ELL, Hispanic and FRL subgroups. It is believed this decline is due to the additional differentiated instruction and support these subgroups required in ELA and Math. Another factor could be two new teachers o the grade level who may not have been as familiar with the grade level science standards.

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.

We scored above the state average in all component areas. The Math Learning Gains component had the greatest positive gap of +14% above the state average. This may be attributed to an increased focus on our bottom quartile students and the implementation of additional professional development for all math teachers.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the most improvement from the prior year, increasing +17% from 48 to 65. New actions included a focus on standards based instruction, differentiated instruction and iReady Standards Mastery. We also implemented a new guided reading program and provided additional support during the intervention block.

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

After reviewing our EWS data, a potential area of concern is our students that earned Level 1 on statewide assessments

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

1. Standards based instruction and lesson planning
2. Differentiated instruction: small group instruction, enrichment and intervention
3. Developing Assessment Capable Learners
4. Community and Parent Engagement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers focused on planning and implementing standards based lessons help increase learning gains in all academic areas. It ensures that expectations for student learning are planned out and teaching practices deliberately focus on agreed upon learning targets.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-21 school year, ELA, Math and Science achievement scores will increase by 4 percentage points with ELA increasing from 68% to 72%, Math from 75% to 79% and Science from 65% to 69%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher Clarity: Unpacking the standards into learning intentions and success criteria in order to plan meaningful, effective and engaging lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity allows for narrowing and focusing activities, eliminating aspects of instruction that don't help learning. It also reinforces the gradual release of responsibility of learning from the teacher to the students so that students feel ownership of their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will use professional development focused on understanding the standards, district instructional focus guide and learning intentions/success criteria to develop engaging lessons.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students will receive instruction using the iReady LAFS and MAFS books to deepen understanding of standards across content areas.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Flocabulary and Reflex Math have been added as additional resources.

Person Responsible	Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will assess mastery of standards throughout the year using iReady Standards Mastery in grades 2-5

Person Responsible	Christina Blashinsky (christina.blashinsky@sarasotacountyschools.net)

All teachers will participate in data chats to determine next steps for instruction in the content areas. Students performing below level will be identified and tracked, referring to SWST as appropriate for targeted interventions.

Person Responsible	Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Parent/Family engagement materials and trainings designed to provide support to parents and families in understanding academic standards and assessments, monitoring student progress and how to work with teachers to improve student achievement will be provided in a variety of formats including Zoom, Teams, and social media.

Person Responsible	Marina Lamela (marina.lamela@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Atwater students are outscoring state average in proficiency in ELA, math and science, indicating strong core instruction; however, a lower percentage of students are making learning gains. This indicates a need for both remediation of standards as well as enrichment to meet the needs of our diverse learners.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-21 school year, students making learning gains in ELA will increase from 69% to 73% and learning gains in math from 76% to 78%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies to be used include Reading Recovery, guided reading, small group instruction and iReady standards mastery
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies promote professional growth and help implement best practices in instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will plan and implement small group lessons that are standards based and geared to meeting the needs of all students in their class.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will be trained on how to use iReady and Benchmark data to plan lessons for small groups and interventions.

Person Responsible	Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Targeted students will participate in the GEER Up after school program focused on improving reading and math proficiency.

Person Responsible	Christina Blashinsky (christina.blashinsky@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Reading Recovery is provided for identified 1st graders. Previous RR students receive ongoing monitoring and support.

Person Responsible	Sandee Coward (sandee.coward@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Students will participate in Guided Reading at their instructional level regularly.

Person Responsible	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)

ELL students will receive increased inclusion support, as well as supplemental support, during the intervention block as needed.

Person Responsible	deborah idoyaga (deborah.idoyaga@sarasotacountyschools.net)

SWD will receive differentiated levels of support based on need through inclusion and small group resource support.

Person Responsible Ami Steiner (ami.steiner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Parent/Family engagement materials and trainings designed to provide support to parents and families will be differentiated based on need and grade level and provided in a variety of formats including Zoom, Teams, and social media.

Person Responsible Marina Lamela (marina.lamela@sarasotacountyschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who are engaged in learning experience increased attention, curiosity, interest, optimism, and passion which extends to the level of motivation they have to learn and progress in their education. When students understand their current performance, recognize the gap between current performance and expected performance and are able to select specific strategies to close that gap, learning becomes not only visible, but also palpable.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-21 school year, students in the lowest 25th percentile making gains in ELA will increase from 65% to 69% and in math from 58% to 62%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence-based strategies to be used include effective feedback, data chats, and student conferencing
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies focus on student data, include academic talk, goal setting, student ownership and leadership skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and students will conference regularly about performance, goal setting, monitoring and feedback.

Person Responsible Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and management strategies will be taught to deepen understanding of content, monitor and regulate the learning process, and engage students.

Person Responsible Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

SWD and ELL students will receive differentiated levels of support based on need through inclusion and small group resource support.

Person Responsible Ami Steiner (ami.steiner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Parent/Family engagement materials and trainings designed to provide support to parents and families in understanding academic standards and assessments, monitoring student progress and how to work with teachers to improve student achievement will be provided in a variety of formats including Zoom, Teams, and social media.

Person Responsible Marina Lamela (marina.lamela@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address school-wide improvement priorities by providing continuous progress monitoring and data chats. Our Student Support Team will provide additional support to identified students.

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.

At Atwater Elementary School we choose to create a community of learners that promotes a positive school culture and environment. Through our Positive Behavior Support Program, our school-wide declaration and H.E.A.R.T. expectations, we give our students the tools necessary to be successful members of our school and the community. Our school partners with Embracing Our Differences "to participate in creating a society where diversity is embraced and individuality is celebrated." We address equity by highlighting support staff and Atwater community members and organizations as resources for students, teachers, and families to help address their specific needs. We also invite stakeholders to participate in various committees that enable them to have a voice in the day-to-day dealings at our school. Finally, our spirit shirt is a very important component of our school, because it allows us to not only embrace our diversity and differences, but celebrate each other and build a sense of community. When we come together as a school and wear our spirit shirt, this unites our kids in creating a school-wide positive environment. Our message will be carried passed our school walls, and it will overflow into our community, ultimately, for all to see our common message and goal...to show our H.E.A.R.T. in all we do and treat others with respect and kindness.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement	$0.00

	Total:	$0.00

https://www.floridacims.org