Manatee County Public Schools

Bayshore High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bayshore High School

5401 34TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34210

https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshore

Demographics

Principal: Wendell Butler

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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: C (47%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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

Bayshore High School

5401 34TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34210

https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshore

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)
High School 9-12	Yes	95%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide to all students an education which prepares them to be college and career ready by engaging them in rigorous academic work that promotes student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating personalized educational experiences and developing productive life-long learners contributing to a global and technological society.

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
Butler, Wendell	Principal	
Brady, Chris	Administrative Support	
Wilson, Robert	Administrative Support	
Gilley, Angelia	Instructional Coach	
	School Counselor	
Polly, Gary	Teacher, K-12	
Poyner, Chrissy	Teacher, K-12	
French, Donald	Assistant Principal	
Carlson, Dorlinda	Assistant Principal	
Mullen, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Jones, Jacquelin	Dean	
Lamar, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Gilmer, Dwight	Instructional Coach	
Distelhurst, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	
Avalos, Sylvia	Teacher, K-12	
Sancho, Gretta	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Wendell Butler

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

85

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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: C (47%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407	356	348	340	1451
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	106	91	272
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	88	56	215
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	87	106	249
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	115	18	252
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	130	118	100	469
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	129	11	116	381

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133	121	108	362

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344	375	371	368	1458
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	96	110	96	428
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	66	63	18	216
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236	145	183	67	631
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	190	166	179	666

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	131	130	129	511

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	344	375	371	368	1458
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126	96	110	96	428
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	66	63	18	216
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	236	145	183	67	631
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131	190	166	179	666

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	131	130	129	511

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	32%	49%	56%	31%	48%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	47%	51%	38%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	37%	42%	30%	35%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	39%	51%	51%	36%	52%	49%
Math Learning Gains	48%	47%	48%	38%	46%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	45%	45%	27%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	41%	67%	68%	52%	73%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	69%	73%	51%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	30%	53%	-23%	55%	-25%
	2018	37%	52%	-15%	53%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	29%	49%	-20%	53%	-24%
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	53%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	69%	-29%	67%	-27%
2018	46%	72%	-26%	65%	-19%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-6%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	55%	71%	-16%	70%	-15%
2018	51%	71%	-20%	68%	-17%
Compare		4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	34%	65%	-31%	61%	-27%
2018	32%	65%	-33%	62%	-30%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	61%	-20%	57%	-16%
2018	41%	56%	-15%	56%	-15%
Compare		0%			

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	11	32	32	16	20		18	34		85	9
ELL	8	35	40	25	45	43	22	26		50	45
BLK	22	43	43	28	37	31	32	36		75	37
HSP	27	40	36	37	47	51	35	50		77	46
MUL	56	47		52			45	86		82	36
WHT	44	51	52	48	56	47	58	76		83	46
FRL	28	41	38	38	45	39	42	53		80	45

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	6	32	40	11	29		20	29		66	31

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
ELL	5	32	39	22	51	56	24	29		41	
BLK	31	48	35	34	55	73	37	43		67	29
HSP	28	48	48	33	49	56	44	49		67	50
MUL	55	65		59	58		79			60	
WHT	46	51	47	51	67	71	60	64		89	50
FRL	32	49	48	37	53	61	46	51		71	44

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	8	22	22	6	8		8	23		47	17
ELL	4	26	26	17	29		27	14			
BLK	16	27	27	26	32	21	37	45		80	43
HSP	26	33	25	33	38	34	50	49		79	58
MUL	57	59		57	47		83	40			
WHT	41	50	45	43	40	19	53	59		84	62
FRL	26	35	24	38	40	27	56	52		79	54

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	58
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	56
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	45
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.

In reviewing our school data from 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, ELA Achievement is our lowest performing area. Looking at trend data, this aligns with how our students have consistently performed in this area. Approximately 70% of our students enroll as 9th grade students with Level 1 or Low Level 2 performance scores. Most students lack skills in reading comprehension, integration of knowledge and ideas, vocabulary, grammar and language, as well as writing. The combination of these factors greatly reduces our student's likelihood of scoring a Level 3 (proficiency) the first time they take their ELA assessment.

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

In reviewing our school data from 2017-2018, 2018-2019, and 2019-2020, Math L25 Learning Gains significantly decreased. In the previous school years, 2017-2018 and 2018-2019, students used a remedial program called SuccessMaker to help address many of their deficient areas of learning in math. In 18-19, we used Khan Academy and Algebra Nation. In 19-20, we used Acaletics and Aleks. We no longer have access to any of the programs, except Aleks in our remedial math courses. Some of the decrease in learning gains is from the learning curve that always comes with a new program. This year's data will give us a better understanding of the efficacy of the programs and help us determine which student deficiencies still need to be addressed.

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.

In reviewing our school data from 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, Science Achievement has the largest gap compared to the state average and is trending down. The factors contributing to this gap are low reading comprehension levels and low vocabulary acquisition in the content area, which can also be tied to our recent increase in ELL students over the past three years.

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

In reviewing our school data from 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, Social Studies Achievement showed the most improvement. Social studies teachers focused more on building content knowledge and vocabulary to help support student learning and less on the analysis of political cartoons. We also increased the number of essays that students produced.

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

In reviewing our EWS data, our biggest area of concern is with attendance 9-12.

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

1. Improve ELA Learning Gains
2. Improve Math Learning Gains
3. Improve Acceleration

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing our school data and student power index, the marginal cost of the number of students needed takes 2.1 students to move our school grade 1% point towards our overall school improvement goals. Students who increase their ability to comprehend complex text have greater academic success across content areas. It also provides students with opportunities to be more successful in accelerated courses such as Dual Enrollment, Adv. Placement, and Industry Certification courses.
Measurable Outcome:	Our intended outcome is to increase the number of L25 students making learning gains on the Grade 9/10 ELA FSA by 4% for the 2020-21 school year from 40% to 44%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We continue our remediation efforts in intensive reading through use of Reading Plus. In our ESOL reading classes, we use Achieve3000. In ReadingPlus, we focus our efforts on students completing four proficient reading passages each week (Avg. 4 readers) at 80% proficiency. (Due to starting school late, students will complete 100 readers for the year). We use small group instruction in intensive reading which includes acceleration of key standards from ELA. class. We are facilitating cooperation through "power pairs"; an intensive reading teacher pairs with an ELA teacher to ensure close cooperation. The ELA and reading teachers focus on the power standard of the month.(Intensive reading teachers will use reading material from NewsELA). In Achieve 3000, ESOL students work at their own level in addition to completing grade level work in Eng through ESOL classes. Use resources such as Vocabulary.com to build content understanding across content areas and grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Plus program is district-adopted and provides strong data correlation between student usage with success at least 80% and how well they perform on the ELA FSA. Focusing on 100 lessons for the year allows students to obtain multiple years of reading growth in efforts to boost reading levels and increase on-grade-level performance. Achieve3000 is district-adopted program and provides strong data correlation between student usage and comprehension growth. For that reason, our district chooses to use the program with ESOL students. Small group instruction is successful when providing differentiated instruction to students. The use of resources ,such as Newsela, provides students with opportunities to read grade-level material while mastering standards. Acceleration is the strongest way to increase the achievement level of low-performing students. Building our lowest readers capacity with the standards prior to their introduction in English class allows intensive reading students to participate more effectively in English classes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students needing Intensive Reading through current ELA FSA data and schedule appropriately into classes.

Person Responsible Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

2. Pair Intensive reading teachers with ELA reading teachers and support their collaborative planning.

Person Responsible Sylvia Avalos (avaloss@manateeschools.net)

3. Monitor student usage and performance on reading plus and provide data chats and support for both.

Person Responsible Sylvia Avalos (avaloss@manateeschools.net)

4. Additionally, monitor department and district common assessments for opportunities to remediate.

Person Responsible Amber Lamar (lamara@manateeschools.net)

5. Develop and use a focus calendar in English and Intensive Reading as well as asking other content areas to participate.

Person Responsible Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)

6. Every teacher will ensure that students complete one PEARL writing per quarter. Administration will monitor that papers are completed.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing our school data and student power index, the marginal cost of the number of students needed it would take us 1.4% students to move our school grade 1% point towards our overall school improvement goals. Students who increase their ability to solve complex problems will have greater opportunities and greater academic success across science, math, and CTE classes. It also will provide students with opportunities to be more successful in accelerated courses such as Dual Enrollment, Adv. Placement, and Industry Certification courses.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the number of overall students making learning gains on the Algebra 1/Geometry FSA EOC by 5% for the 2020-21 school year from 45% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase our L25 math scores. we will provide remediation for Algebra 1 and Geometry by double-blocking students with Intensive Math and Liberal Arts Math. For students in Alg 1-B, they are double-blocked in Intensive Math with the same teacher. We use Aleks in Intensive Math, Alg 1 H, and LAM 1/2 to support student deficiencies and reinforce skills in math. We continue using Math Nation at the Geometry level as a support/enrichment tool in LAM and Geo classes as needed.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Double-blocking will increase the time on task for students who are not proficient in math. Small group direct instruction is successful when providing differentiated instruction to students. The use of resources such as Aleks provides students with additional opportunities to work with grade-level math material while mastering the standards.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Identify students who have scored below proficiency and double-block them in either Alg 1-B/Intensive Math or Liberal Arts 2/Geometry.	
Person Responsible	Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)
2. Implement and monitor small group instruction in Intensive Math and Liberal Arts Math 2.	
Person Responsible	Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)
3. Monitor reports from programs for effectiveness and opportunities to remediate.	
Person Responsible	Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)
4. Monitor district common assessments for opportunities to remediate and clarify standards.	
Person Responsible	Gretta Sancho (sanchog@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing our school data and student power index, the marginal cost of the number of students needed, it would take us 3.4 students to move our school grade 1% point towards our overall school improvement goals. Students who experience ongoing rigor increase their ability to read complex texts and solve complex problems As a result, students have greater opportunities and greater academic success across content areas. Students who take accelerated courses such as Dual Enrollment, Adv. Placement, and Industry Certification courses, increase their scores in any post- secondary education.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the number of students scoring at proficiency or higher on Advanced Placement Exams/Dual Enrollment Courses/or Industry Certifications Exams by 3% for the 2020-21 school year which is 44% to 47%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Mullen (mullenm@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase the number of students scoring at proficiency or higher on acceleration assessments, we will add additional CTE programs such as certified nurses assistant (cna). We will triple the size of our Digital Informational Technology classes. We will continue to use software such as Adobe Cloud, Microsoft Office Suites, QuickBooks Pro, and SolidWorks, to develop and practice the skills necessary to obtain certifications. We will use web-based programs such as G-Metrix and Code.Org, to develop and practice skills necessary to obtain certifications. We will use the online curriculum Pixar in a Box from Khan Academy for Media Production.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Offering additional programs increase the variety and number of options available to students. This increases their chances of having further post- secondary opportunities. Since many students from our school go straight to the work force, it allows students with certifications to obtain employment at a higher wage than a high school diploma.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Identify candidates that would be interested in CTE courses by gpa and interest.	
Person Responsible	Dwight Gilmer (gilmerg@manateeschools.net)
2. Place as many 9th grade students as possible in DIT to improve their basic computing skills.	
Person Responsible	Dorlinda Carlson (carlsonl@manateeschools.net)
3. Identify and target students that are proficient in math and or reading to take AP and Dual Enrollment courses.	
Person Responsible	Dwight Gilmer (gilmerg@manateeschools.net)
5. Provide students multiple opportunities to take the PERT so they can qualify for dual enrollment.	
Person Responsible	Robert Wilson (wilsonr@manateeschools.net)

6. Provide the SAT during the school day, waivers for students, and sign students up for PSAT and Khan Academy so that students can work on deficiencies and thereby qualify for dual enrollment.

Person Responsible Robert Wilson (wilsonr@manateeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing our school data and student power index, it would take us 2.5 students to move our school grade 1% point towards our overall school improvement goals. Students who experience ongoing rigor increase their ability to read complex texts and solve complex problems As a result, students have greater opportunities and greater academic success across content areas such as science (biology).
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase the number of students scoring at proficiency or higher on the Biology EOC by 5% for the 2020-21 school year which is 41% to 46%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Donald French (frenchd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Some of the evidence-based strategies the biology teachers will use to increase scores include writing, in this case, including a minimum of one lab report that contains analysis for the first three quarters of the year. Science will also use appropriate graphic organizers to aid students in becoming proficient in analysis. In addition, vocabulary acquisition is imperative. We use interactive word walls on the most important words per unit. We use district benchmarks and, when necessary, additional department common assessments on power benchmarks. In addition, students will use USA Test Prep to reinforce their content knowledge.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to our traditionally low reading scores, we work to increase our students' reading comprehension and reading fluency. Writing and vocabulary are an important part of building these skills. We believe content-specific writing, developing anaylysis skills, and increasing vocabulary acquisition will improve students ability to perform on the test. District benchmarks will help us identify student deficiencies and when we receive results, we will mediate and then check for improvement through common assessments. Finally, we will reinforce the content knowledge through repetition of facts through USA Test Prep.

Action Steps to Implement	
1. Identify the most impactful unit per quarter per science subject 9th through 11th grade.	
Person Responsible	Andrea Distelhurst (distelhursta@manateeschools.net)
Have students perform a lab ("in real lfe" or virtual) and have them write a lab report including analysis of results.	
Person Responsible	Andrea Distelhurst (distelhursta@manateeschools.net)
Teachers will link graphic organizers with all analysis in class to help students learn how to analyze facts and concepts.	
Person Responsible	Donald French (frenchd@manateeschools.net)
Identifying key words per unit to include on the word wall.	
Person Responsible	Andrea Distelhurst (distelhursta@manateeschools.net)
Setting up and using interactive word walls.	
Person Responsible	Sylvia Avalos (avaloss@manateeschools.net)

Analyzing district benchmark results and determining which standards need remediated.

Person Responsible Andrea Distelhurst (distelhursta@manateeschools.net)

Writing common assessments to determine if remediation was successful.

Person Responsible Andrea Distelhurst (distelhursta@manateeschools.net)

Determining appropriate usage of USA Test Prep.

Person Responsible Donald French (frenchd@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Improve ELA Learning Gains
2. Improve Math Learning Gains
3. Improve Acceleration
4. Improve Biology

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.

We plan to build positive relationships with parents through our school and community events such as the Annual Title One Meeting, Back to School Night, AVID Meetings, Parent University Meetings, College Night, Family Financial Aid Night , Choice Night, and our annual Awards Ceremony among other opportunities.This year it will be more difficult to meet with stakeholders due to the challenges of Covid. Many events will be virtual. and it's harder to forge a relationship through a virtual medium. Forging relationships under these circumstances take more effort on the part of the school community and the stakeholders.

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	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00