Collier County Public Schools

Manatee 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 20

Budget to Support Goals 20

Manatee Elementary School

1880 MANATEE RD, Naples, FL 34114

https://www.collierschools.com/mes

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Mearsheimer

Start Date for this Principal: 10/17/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Collier 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

Manatee Elementary School

1880 MANATEE RD, Naples, FL 34114

https://www.collierschools.com/mes

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	90%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

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 Collier 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.

We are leaders who believe we can grow and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower a community of responsible life-long leaders and learners who are motivated to achieve personal and academic growth and success.

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
Mearsheimer, Laurie	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Ensures fidelity of instruction, adherence to standards, and oversees multi-tiered system of support for students. Leads the observation, evaluation and employee discipline process. Attends and provides feedback during grade level collaborative planning meetings. Facilitates and oversees professional development of the staff.
Antonetti, Dena	Assistant Principal	Assists principal in administration of the school including, ensuring fidelity of instruction, adherence to standards, monitoring the multi-tiered system of support and discipline of students. Observes and evaluates employees. Attends and provides feedback during grade level collaborative planning meetings. Facilitates and supports professional development of the staff. Serves as the testing coordinator for the school.
Cowan, Lori	Other	ESE Program Specialist. Responsible for facilitating IEP, EP and 504 meetings and the compliance of procedures and processes related to special education services and accommodations.
Eby, Deborah	School Counselor	Works with groups and individual students to support social emotional needs. Primary facilitator and trainer of positive behavior support systems for the school. Coordinates health and vision screenings.
Krohn, Michelle	Instructional Coach	1.0 Reading Coach - supports reading and writing curriculum, instruction, progress monitoring/assessment in grades PreK-5.
Thomas, Kristina	Instructional Coach	.5 Math Coach - supports math curriculum, instruction, progress monitoring/assessment in grades PreK-5. .5 Resource Teacher - supports students receiving multi-tiered system of support.
Dunn, Allyson	Instructional Coach	.5 Math Coach - supports math curriculum, instruction, progress monitoring/assessment in grades PreK-5. .5 ESE Inclusion Teacher- supports students with IEP math goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/17/2016, Laurie Mearsheimer

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.*

3

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

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (57%) 2015-16: C (53%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	82	86	84	101	86	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
Attendance below 90 percent	10	8	6	10	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	90	87	95	96	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	7	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	7	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	90	87	95	96	91	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	561
Attendance below 90 percent	7	8	7	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	23	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	7	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	54%	60%	57%	51%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	50%	59%	58%	55%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	51%	53%	49%	57%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	65%	68%	63%	63%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	64%	62%	69%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	55%	51%	61%	58%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	59%	53%	48%	54%	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	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
	2018	41%	59%	-18%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
	2018	52%	59%	-7%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	68%	-11%	62%	-5%
	2018	46%	67%	-21%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	65%	-7%	64%	-6%
	2018	68%	67%	1%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	74%	67%	7%	60%	14%
	2018	59%	68%	-9%	61%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%
	2018	36%	58%	-22%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
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	30	40	41	37	52	46	21				
ELL	47	47	46	58	66	56	50				
BLK	47	49	50	61	64	59	38				
HSP	54	50	38	65	70	51	58				
WHT	71	63		79	75						
FRL	51	48	44	64	68	53	51				

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	33	41	27	36	43	33	35				
ELL	36	58	56	46	60	59	14				
BLK	56	61	59	59	60	44	38				
HSP	51	59	45	60	64	55	39				
WHT	59	50		74	67						
FRL	52	59	50	60	63	51	40				

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	17	38	25	28	55	47	17				
ELL	35	48	43	52	62	55	16				
BLK	53	63	47	57	65	56	42				
HSP	48	53	50	64	70	64	46				
WHT	80	50		86	83						
FRL	50	54	50	63	69	61	46				

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	55
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	53
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	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	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.

4th grade ELA showed the lowest performance with 27% of students scoring >=3 on FY20 QBA1 and 38% on QBA2. This was not a trend for either the cohort group or the grade level as this cohort group of students had 51% scoring >=3 on their 3rd grade FSA and 45% of FY19 4th graders scored >=3 on FY19 FSA ELA. The SWD subgroup in 4th grade also showed the lowest performance with 17% of students scoring >=3 on FY20 QBA1 and 11% on FY20 QBA2. Contributing factors included negative implications of a large co-teaching model as well as lack of differentiation in Cambridge/non-Cambridge departmentalized classes.

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

4th grade Math proficiency showed the greatest decline. 4th grade Math FY19 FSA Math proficiency (>=3) was 58% (cohort 3rd grade scores 57% >=3) with FY20 QBA1 proficiency of 42% and FY20 QBA2 proficiency of 40%. Contributing factors included negative implications of a large co-teaching model as well as lack of differentiation in Cambridge/non-Cambridge departmentalized classes.

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.

4th grade Math proficiency had the greatest gap on district FY20 QBA1 and QBA2 assessments. The FY20 QBA1 gap was 10% (MES 54%, District 64%) and the FY20 QBA2 gap was 11% (MES 51%, District 62%). Contributing factors included negative implications of a large co-teaching model as well as lack of differentiation in Cambridge/non-Cambridge departmentalized classes.

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

SWD in 5th grade showed the most improvement in both ELA and Math. In ELA, the percentage of SWD scoring >=3 on FY19 FSA (cohort group) improved from 13% to 24% on FY20 QBA1 and 20% on FY20 QBA2. In Math, the percentage of SWD scoring >=3 on FY19 FSA (cohort group) improved from 25% to 40% on FY20 QBA2. New actions that contributed to this improvement included departmentalization in 5th grade to better utilize strengths, increased collaboration (whole team approach) and clustered classes to allow for more frequent and consistent resource/ESE support.

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

1. SWD proficiency (ESSA subgroup) with focus on 3rd grade (25% of grade level identified SWD/T3 - highest grade level percentage)
2. Instructional/student support and accountability for Collier Connect with focus on 5th grade (61% of 5th grade students participating compared to 44% overall); last year's data indicated greatest areas of academic concern in both ELA and Math with this cohort group of students

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

1. ELA proficiency - overall (FY19 FSA 54%, FY20 QBA1 42%, FY20 QBA2 47%)
2. Math proficiency - overall (FY19 FSA 65%, FY20 QBA1 43%, FY20 QBA2 52%)
3. SWD (ESSA subgroup) - proficiency
4. Accountability/engagement in Collier Connect

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA proficiency is an area of focus for our school. Overall ELA proficiency decreased last year as compared to 54% on FY19 FSA (FY20 QBA1 42%, QBA2 47%). Fidelity to standards-based instruction, appropriately differentiated intervention and focused, independent student practice will have a positive impact on students' reading achievement and proficiency levels.
Measurable Outcome:	If students are provided appropriately differentiated instruction with sufficient practice opportunities, then overall proficiency on the 20/21 ELA FSA will increase by a minimum of 3% (from 54% to at least 57%). In addition, 100% of students will meet or exceed our school's Wildly Important Goal (WIG) of a minimum of one year's growth in iReady.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Krohn (krohnm@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will collaboratively plan to ensure adherence to standards-based instruction and use of iReady data for differentiated and targeted small group instruction (monitoring progress and reteaching specific skills as necessary). In addition to whole and small group instruction, students will spend a minimum of 45 minutes per week independently completing iReady lessons (with a goal of a minimum 70% pass rate).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction, differentiated to meet the needs of individual students, is crucial to student achievement and progression of reading skills. Consistent use of iReady during the literacy block for independent practice will contribute to additional improvement in reading levels and abilities. Teacher monitoring and reteaching will ensure that students continue to make forward progress in the program.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will meet weekly for collaborative lesson planning to ensure adherence to standards-based instruction that is differentiated to meet the needs of the students in each classroom. Reading coach and administration will attend planning meetings to monitor and provide support with unpacking standards and aligning instruction.

Person Responsible Michelle Krohn (krohnm@collierschools.com)

Reading Coach will provide professional development for effective implementation of small group, differentiated instruction. In addition to targeted professional learning sessions, PD will be provided via coaching cycles and individual teacher support.

Person Responsible Michelle Krohn (krohnm@collierschools.com)

Reading Coach will collaborate with teachers to ensure that they are monitoring student progress in iReady, reteaching as needed, and having regular data chats with their students to discuss and track progress in their Leadership Notebooks. Reading Coach will also support class "data trackers" as they record their class' weekly pass rate on our school-wide scoreboard.

Person Responsible Michelle Krohn (krohnm@collierschools.com)

Reading Coach will meet with all classes to discuss the purpose and importance of completing a minimum of 45 minutes per week on iReady. She will review our school-wide WIG and the expectation for data tracking weekly (goal of 70% pass rate) as well as quarterly towards the goal of a minimum of one year's growth (based on individual Diagnostic 1 baseline scores).

Person Responsible	Michelle Krohn (krohnm@collierschools.com)

Administration will observe in classrooms to monitor for alignment of lesson planning with instructional implementation. Small group instruction (guided reading and MTSS intervention) will be observed to monitor for appropriate differentiation and targeted support. Feedback will be provided to teachers via the FTEM process as well as through individual teacher conferences.

Person Responsible	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math proficiency is an area of focus for our school. Overall Math proficiency decreased last year as compared to 65% on FY19 FSA (FY20 QBA1 43%, QBA2 52%). Fidelity to district curriculum maps and pacing guides, as well as ongoing progress monitoring and differentiated instruction, will have a positive impact on students' math achievement and proficiency levels.
Measurable Outcome:	If 100% of teachers adhere to district curriculum/pacing guides while monitoring student progress and providing differentiated support, then overall proficiency on the 20/21 Math FSA will increase by a minimum of 3% (from 65% to at least 68%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristina Thomas (thomaskr@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math Coach(s) will participate in collaborative planning to ensure adherence to district curriculum maps and pacing guides as well as to provide support and monitor for plans for differentiation for identified students and areas of need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Math Coach(s) have in-depth knowledge and understanding of district curriculum maps and pacing guides and are can use their expertise in math content and strategies to support teachers in effective planning for core and differentiated math instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Math Coach(s) will participate in collaborative planning with teachers to ensure adherence to district curriculum maps and pacing guides. Pacing will be tracked weekly in Teams with individual action plans as needed if pacing varies by 3 or more days. Instructional planning focus will include ongoing progress monitoring and planning for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Kristina Thomas (thomaskr@collierschools.com)

Administration will observe in classrooms to monitor for alignment of lesson planning with instructional implementation and appropriate differentiation. Feedback will be provided to teachers via the FTEM process as well as through individual teacher conferences.

Person Responsible	Dena Antonetti (antond@collierschools.com)

Math Coach(s) will provide ongoing professional development for each module on strategies for differentiating instruction while keeping on pace with content. In addition to ongoing targeted professional learning sessions, PD will be provided via coaching cycles and individual teacher support as needed.

Person Responsible	Kristina Thomas (thomaskr@collierschools.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	One area of focus for us is intervention for our SWD subgroup as only 36% of students in this subgroup were proficient on the 2018/2019 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	If we ensure that all SWD receive daily targeted intervention, then we will increase the percentage of proficient students in the SWD subgroup on FSA by at least 5% to achieve a minimum 41% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our master instructional schedule will ensure that 100% of all SWD will receive daily targeted intervention.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted intervention will provide additional instructional support for students in specific areas of need.

Action Steps to Implement

Targeted MTSS intervention groups based on identified areas of need will provide additional instructional support for SWD. Groups will be flexible and change as needed based on ongoing progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible	Lori Cowan (cowanlo@collierschools.com)

All SWD in grades 3, 4 and 5 will be invited to participate in our after-school program for additional support.

Person Responsible	Susan Pratt (prattsu@collierschools.com)

Administration will observe during MTSS intervention blocks to monitor for appropriate differentiation and targeted support. Feedback will be provided to teachers via the FTEM process as well as through individual teacher conferences.

Person Responsible	Dena Antonetti (antond@collierschools.com)

Administration will monitor lesson plans to ensure that appropriate ESE accommodations are planned for students per their individual IEPs. Use of accommodations will also be a "look for" during observations.

Person Responsible	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance in Collier Connect classes will be monitored daily with immediate parent/student contact for student absences. Progress monitoring for coursework completion and student progress will take place during scheduled weekly meetings with teachers, academic coaches and administration. Additional supports or interventions will be implemented as needed.

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.

As a Leader in Me school, our work is focused on the three pillars of academics, leadership and culture. Every classroom begins their day with D.E.A.L. time ("drop everything and lead") to foster positive culture and understanding/demonstration of the 7 Habits. We have a weekly leadership focus and manatee manner of the week. Staff and student celebrations of both progress and success are an integral part of our daily work. We will continue to host parent events and student led conferences (via WebEx as needed this year) to ensure family connections and involvement. We are also hosting monthly Parent Partner meetings this year on a variety of topics with guest speakers including our school counselor, psychologist, deputy, etc. Community support is fostered by developing positive, collaborative relationships with neighboring businesses and organizations.

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				$169,648.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.35	$29,495.00
			Notes: Reading resource teachers (.25 Thomas and .1 Radlovacki)			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$100,299.00
			Notes: Reading coach (1.0 Krohn)			
	5100	150-Aides	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	$22,601.00
			Notes: Spanish tutor - ELA support (.5 Saravia)			
	7800	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,718.00

			Notes: Transportation for after-school program - ELA support			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C	0.15	$11,153.00
			Notes: Migrant resource teacher (.15 Radlovacki) - ELA support			
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C		$1,864.00
			Notes: Migrant after-school program - Instructional (ELA support)			
	5900	150-Aides	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C		$2,284.00
			Notes: Migrant after-school program - tutors (ELA support)			
	5900	510-Supplies	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C		$234.00
			Notes: Migrant after-school program supplies			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$157,659.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.35	$29,495.00
			Notes: Math resource teachers (.25 Thomas and .1 Radlovacki)			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$88,544.00
			Notes: Math coaches (.5 Thomas and .5 Dunn)			
	5100	150-Aides	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A	0.5	$22,601.00
			Notes: Spanish tutor - Math support (.5 Saravia)			
	7800	790-Miscellaneous Expenses	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,718.00
			Notes: Transportation for after-school program - Math support			
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C	0.15	$11,153.00
			Notes: Migrant resource teacher (.15 Radlovacki) - Math support			
	5900	150-Aides	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C		$2,284.00
			Notes: Migrant after-school program - tutors (Math support)			
	5900	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0421 - Manatee Elementary School	Title, I Part C		$1,864.00
			Notes: Migrant after-school program - Instructional (Math support)			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$327,307.00**