

Manatee County Public Schools

Oneco 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	21

Oneco Elementary School

5214 22ND STREET CT E, Bradenton, FL 34203

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

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 6/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CS&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 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	21

Oneco Elementary School

5214 22ND STREET CT E, Bradenton, FL 34203

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Oneco Elementary School is to advocate and provide a safe environment where families are inspired to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to build relationships in order to motivate and educate children to excel in their chosen paths; therefore becoming responsible citizens and contributors to their communities.

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
Williams, Nicole	Principal	Responsibilities and duties as the school principal are: Teacher Evaluation Facilitate school leadership and improvement Support staff and student Collect, analyze, and organize data Monitor school-wide core and supplemental curriculum Facilitate/lead professional development Monitor school-wide PBIS Facilitate collaborative planning
Campbell, Beth	Assistant Principal	Responsibilities and job duties of the assistant principal are as follows: Teacher Evaluation Supervise and evaluate paraprofessionals Administrator for test administration Community and Business Partner Outreach Monitor and maintain data for Acaletics Math Instructional leader Facilitate collaborative planning
Hicks, Tori	Assistant Principal	Responsibilities and job duties for the assistant principal are: Teacher Evaluation Monitor and participate as administrator of MTSS ILT/Data team member Administrator for textbook inventory Instructional leader Facilitate collaborative planning
Stevens, Marsha	Instructional Coach	Instructional leader Facilitate professional development sessions with teachers Facilitate collaborative planning

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/8/2020, Nicole Williams

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: D (40%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%) 2015-16: D (34%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CS&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	102	82	108	101	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	56	31	46	54	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	11	17	15	10	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	7	11	8	15	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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 6/8/2020

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	97	141	107	122	113	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	695
Attendance below 90 percent	20	16	17	18	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	9	7	16	40	22	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	49	46	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	49	46	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

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	9	7	8	34	38	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	97	141	107	122	113	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	695
Attendance below 90 percent	20	16	17	18	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	9	7	16	40	22	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	49	46	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	49	46	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

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	9	7	8	34	38	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	149

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	24%	52%	57%	22%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	57%	58%	48%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	55%	53%	65%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	63%	63%	38%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	68%	62%	54%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	53%	51%	43%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	24%	48%	53%	13%	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	26%	51%	-25%	58%	-32%
	2018	19%	49%	-30%	57%	-38%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	26%	56%	-30%	58%	-32%
	2018	24%	51%	-27%	56%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	19%	52%	-33%	56%	-37%
	2018	25%	52%	-27%	55%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	36%	60%	-24%	62%	-26%
	2018	41%	56%	-15%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	65%	-9%	64%	-8%
	2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	22%	48%	-26%	53%	-31%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	28%	49%	-21%	55%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	8	30	44	23	45	36	24				
ELL	18	45	42	38	54	50	18				
BLK	13	43	40	36	50	27					
HSP	22	40	38	40	52	35	21				
MUL	30			50							
WHT	43	54		65	79		69				
FRL	21	43	53	41	57	34	22				
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	5	30	43	22	48	47	21				
ELL	15	45	52	43	52	46	14				
BLK	14	36		34	53	73	29				
HSP	23	47	50	49	53	48	21				
WHT	32	31		56	70		50				
FRL	21	41	49	45	57	62	25				
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	7	46	80	21	46	44	6				
ELL	9	45	67	26	49	46	3				
BLK	10	50		21	48	40	7				
HSP	17	43	66	36	53	40	9				
WHT	42	55		56	65		27				
FRL	18	43	64	35	52	37	12				

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	41
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	30
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	62
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	41
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.

The lowest components were ELA and Science Achievement. Contributing factors were lack of science instruction in the third and fourth grades, as well as high turnover of teachers for the school year.

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

The Math L25 learning gains had the greatest decline. This was due to the lack of standards-based planning, teacher content area knowledge, and inconsistency in instruction.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA achievement had the greatest gap in comparison to the state, 33% below. Writing instruction began late in the school year, and teachers were resistant to direction from the district.

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

ELA learning gains showed the most improvement (2%). The implementation of SRA was an action taken the previous school year.

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

Students scoring level 1 on FSA.

Number of student with one or more suspensions.

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

1. Standards-based collaborative planning by grade level teams.
2. Increasing ELA and Science achievement.
3. Increase Math L25 learning gains.
4. Increase in achievement across sub groups.
5. Decrease the number of students with one or more suspensions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus	Purposeful Standards-Based Instruction
Description and Rationale:	Lack of understanding the rigor of the Florida State Standards. By May 2021, 40% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science as measure by state assessments through learning experiences aligned with grade level expectations/standards. We will see an increase in achievement across all sub groups as follows: SWD – ELA 8% to 25 % Math 23% to 35% African American – ELA 13% to 30% Math 36% to 50 % ELL – ELA 18% to 30% Math 40% 50% Hispanic – ELA 22% to 35% Math 40% to 50% Multi-racial – ELA 30% to 45% Math 50% to 60% Student achievement will increase in all content areas through support in planning standards-based instruction.
Measurable Outcome:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional leadership team will facilitate weekly collaborative planning and professional development with grade level teams to ensure students receive standards-based instruction aligned with grade level expectations. Data will be collected and analyzed using the teacher evaluation system, district benchmark assessments, Next Steps running records, lesson plans, rubrics, iReady, and common formative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our data has shown there is a lack of instruction meeting the level of the standards (rigor). Data will be used to drive instructional decisions and shifts as needed.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional leadership team will facilitate collaborative planning with grade level teams. 2. Teachers will be provided collaborative planning after school. 3. Instructional leadership team will provide targeted small group instruction through differentiated lessons based on student data. 4. Purchase supplemental materials to support student learning. (LAFS/MAFS) 5. Monthly progress monitoring of data with classroom teachers, ESE resource teachers, reading coach, ELL teachers and administration. 6. Administration will monitor instruction through walk-throughs and lesson plan review. 	
Person Responsible	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Instructional Delivery
Description and Rationale:	Lack of school wide cohesiveness instruction due to the increased teacher turnover during 19-20 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	<p>By May 2021, 40% of the students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science as measure by state assessments through learning experiences aligned with grade level expectations/standards.</p> <p>Student achievement will increase in all content areas by receiving research based instructional delivery.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Instructional Leadership Team will model and support grade level classroom teachers with instructional delivery framework (GRR) to meet the needs of students. This will ensure students receive consistent effective standards-based instructional delivery in all academic areas.</p> <p>Data will be collected and analyzed using the teacher evaluation system, district benchmark assessments, Next Steps running records, lesson plans, rubrics, iReady, and common formative assessments.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Gradual Release of Responsibility provides several scaffolds through explicit teaching of thinking strategies to independent practice to meet the grade level expectation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructional leaders will provide professional development of lesson structure to include the instructional delivery framework (GRR).
2. Instructional leaders will facilitate and model instructional delivery during collaborative planning with grade level teams.
3. Provide classroom materials and supplies that support student learning using the instructional framework.
4. Instruction will be adjusted for whole and small groups, including tutoring groups as a result of data analysis.
5. Before and after school tutoring for students will be provided.

Person Responsible Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus	Application of the Positive Behavior System
Description and Rationale:	Lack of training, participation, and consistency with implementing PBIS plan with school staff.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2021, there will be a decrease in the number of referrals by 30%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Review report cards quarterly, ClassDojo, agendas, positive recognition of students, and FOCUS data will be used to adjust strategies of implementation of the Positive Behavior System. We will also implement Purposeful people to include SEL lessons in the classroom.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School referral data has shown inconsistency in participation of PBIS and classroom management strategies. A school-wide emphasis on positive behavior and character development will provide students more positive opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School based PBIS and Purposeful People training.
2. Incorporate SEL in content area lessons.
3. Behavior Tech to support student in classrooms (monitor behavior, redirection, etc.)

Person Responsible Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement**Area of Focus** Parent Engagement**Description****and Rationale:** Lack of home support to reinforce student learning in all content areas.**Measurable Outcome:**

By May 2021, a 10% increase of parent involvement will be evident by the number of parent participation for school events (SAC, evening events, conferences, etc.), feedback (surveys) and communication (agendas, phone, class apps).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Agendas, attendance for school events, SAC attendance, surveys, and conference night sign-in sheets data will be used to determine next steps to increase parent engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Establish positive relationships and invite families to parent information nights/school events, Title 1 parent meetings, parent surveys completed and returned, and parent/teacher communication in student agendas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Parent information nights to provide standards-based professional development in reading, mathematics, and science to include resources and strategies to use at home with students.
2. School/Classroom newsletters, homework, surveys, and class communication apps to outline standards and application for families.
3. Staff will participate in a book study to build positive relationships with families.

Person Responsible

Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will support and monitor small group instruction, provide mentors, create community partnerships in efforts to increase achievement in sub groups.

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.

The Parent Liaison and the Graduation Enhancement Technician will work together with families, community business partners, and community resources to increase involvement and build relationships. The Parent Liaison will communicate with families and encourage involvement in school activities.

Additionally, Oneco Elementary is receiving increased support in developing a positive school culture and environment through the School Climate Transformation Grant Program. This five-year federal grant initiative focuses on the revision of a Behavioral MTSS Framework, development of an Implementation Rubric, and the implementation of Tier I and Tier II programming based on the school's unique data. The grant involves a number of stakeholders through several key actions including the School Climate Task force for strategic planning, and focus groups to gather school climate data. Additionally, with this grant, Oneco is in the process of implementing a school-wide Social Emotional Learning curricula.

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: Collaborative Planning				\$166,962.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$72,768.74
			<i>Notes: School Improvement Specialist will facilitate professional development and collaborative planning with grade level teachers.</i>			
	6400	210-Retirement	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$13,268.20
			<i>Notes: Retirement for staff.</i>			
	6400	220-Social Security	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$10,150.17
			<i>Notes: Social Security for staff.</i>			
	6400	231-Health and Hospitalization	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$9,096.09

			<i>Notes: Health Insurance for School Improvement Specialist.</i>			
	6400	232-Life Insurance	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$160.09
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance for School Improvement Specialist.</i>			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,605.45
			<i>Notes: Workers Compensation for staff.</i>			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG	1.09	\$59,913.26
			<i>Notes: Facilitated collaborative planning NCH</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$21,064.88
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$15,064.88
			<i>Notes: Supplies for student learning for before and after school tutoring.</i>			
	5100	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: Technology related supplies to support student learning.</i>			
	5100	520-Textbooks	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Textbook materials to support student learning.</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				\$50,306.37
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5200	150-Aides	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$37,346.29
			<i>Notes: Behavior Tech will support students with changing behaviors. The Behavior Tech will monitor and mentor students throughout the school day in efforts to reduce out of school suspensions, stress, and frustration.</i>			
	5200	210-Retirement	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$3,734.63
			<i>Notes: Retirement for Behavior Tech.</i>			
	5200	220-Social Security	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,856.99
			<i>Notes: FICA for Behavior Tech</i>			
	5200	231-Health and Hospitalization	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$4,834.41
			<i>Notes: Health Insurance for Behavior Tech.</i>			
	5200	232-Life Insurance	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$82.16
			<i>Notes: Life Insurance for Behavior Tech.</i>			
	5200	240-Workers Compensation	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$451.89

			Notes: Workers Compensation for Behavior Tech.			
	5200	510-Supplies	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,000.00
			Notes: Supplies for Behavior Tech.			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement				\$0.00
Total:						\$251,346.25