
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

G D Rogers Garden Bullock Elementary

515 13TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

Demographics

Principal: Michael Escorcia

Start Date for this Principal: 6/5/2017

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: C (51%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

G D Rogers Garden Bullock Elementary

515 13TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">91%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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 committed to academic excellence and equity for every student in every classroom every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our students will be successful in both academics and behavior so that they can create and accomplish goals for their future.

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
------	-------	---------------------------------

Hinkley, Travis	Instructional Coach	<p>The School Leadership Team has the following duties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To meet weekly as an Instructional Leadership Team to analyze data provided by IREADY diagnostic, Benchmark assessments, Acaletics Scrimmages, SRA and grade level formative assessments in Reading, Math, Science and Writing. 2. To use the results of data analysis to improve instruction in whole group, small group, and to individual students based on needs indicated by the data. 3. To provide support and scaffolding for teachers based on what the data indicates is necessary. 4. To implement and support the initiatives of the school and the county by monitoring instructional practices, providing guidance and PD to teachers, and using data to assess the fidelity of programs and initiatives. 5. To involve all teachers in 1-3 through weekly grade level PLCs, which serve as data chats and follow-up PD sessions. 6. We collaborate together to make decisions regarding curriculum, instruction and professional development for our school.
-----------------	---------------------	---

These are the members this year:

- Beth Severson: Reading Coach
- Travis Hinkley, Instructional Specialist
- Randy Stowers, AP
- Livia Forrest, AP
- Pat Stream, Principal

Stream, Pat	Principal	Beth Severson, Reading Coach is also a member of the School Leadership Team
-------------	-----------	---

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/5/2017, Michael Escorcia

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

25

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: C (51%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (37%) 2015-16: D (35%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	86	89	113	70	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	10	22	24	16	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	2	6	11	23	20	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	2	5	12	10	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	

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	89	93	94	105	81	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	4	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	1	2	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	89	93	94	105	81	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	540
Attendance below 90 percent	2	5	4	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	28	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

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	2	1	2	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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%	52%	57%	22%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	57%	58%	42%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	55%	53%	66%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	54%	63%	63%	28%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	68%	62%	39%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	53%	51%	46%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	48%	53%	19%	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	19%	51%	-32%	58%	-39%
	2018	26%	49%	-23%	57%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	56%	-7%	58%	-9%
	2018	28%	51%	-23%	56%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
05	2019	25%	52%	-27%	56%	-31%
	2018	18%	52%	-34%	55%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	60%	-13%	62%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	58%	65%	-7%	64%	-6%
	2018	30%	61%	-31%	62%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		28%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	49%	60%	-11%	60%	-11%
	2018	40%	58%	-18%	61%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	25%	48%	-23%	53%	-28%
	2018	20%	49%	-29%	55%	-35%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	28	57	57	44	66	46	28				
ELL	24	52	62	56	80	69	11				
BLK	23	43	50	45	74	63	16				
HSP	31	57	63	54	77	59	20				
MUL	29			64							
WHT	70	83		75	75		70				
FRL	30	53	59	54	74	53	25				

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	17	46	47	30	52	38	19				
ELL	20	39	26	42	63	55	20				
BLK	19	40	55	33	39	42	10				
HSP	26	34	24	38	59	50	21				
MUL	31			44							
WHT	71	62		75	67						
FRL	27	41	38	40	54	49	22				

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	14	31	36	16	35		8				
ELL	13	44	69	25	46	60	15				
BLK	20	35	64	17	18	20	5				
HSP	17	44	68	30	50	63	20				
MUL	36			36							
WHT	65	60		53	55						
FRL	20	40	66	25	38	49	15				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	66
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	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	45
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	53
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	47
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	75
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	52
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.

Science, reading achievement. Students lack vocabulary and background knowledge to be successful in reading comprehension and the ability to read and interpret the science test accurately.

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

No data components showed a decline from the previous year. Science showed the smallest increase followed by reading achievement. See above for contributing factors.

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.

Science and reading for the reasons mentioned above.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. WE did after school tutoring and Saturday school. We engaged in differentiated instruction for the lowest 25% in reading using small group instruction.

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

Attendance below 90%

Level 1 on FSA Reading Achievement in 2019, with a focus on grade 3

Out of school suspensions

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

1. Reading achievement, student growth and growth of the lowest quartile
2. Science achievement
3. Social Emotional Learning for all students.
4. Reduction of chronically and Tier 2 student absences.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our lowest area of proficiency is ELA across all subgroups as shown by the needs-analysis section of the SIP with the exception of the white subgroup.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021 school year, students will increase their reading proficiency as measured by at least 38% of students scoring proficient on the FSA and FSSA reading tests, and/or at least 50% of the students demonstrating growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: If we engage in the Learning Focused Framework, then students will increase their reading proficiency as measured by 38% or higher of the students scoring proficient on the FSA/ FSSA reading tests by the end of the 2021 school year, or by at least 50% of the students demonstrating growth on the FSA/FSSA reading tests.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: This is the strategy chosen for our school reform model. It is based on meta-analysis of all the most effective best practices, heavily drawing on the work of Marzano, Hattie, et al. We have increased our grade from a mid-D to a High C.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan with teams weekly using standards-based backwards planning incorporating the components of Learning-Focused Planning Design.

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

2.. Engage in Professional Learning Communities two times each month with grade level teams, which will include collaborative data review and related professional development, as the data indicates is necessary.

Person Responsible Livia Forrest (forrestl@manateeschools.net)

3. Maximize students' dialogic engagement with high-yield instructional techniques advocated in Fisher and Frey's Teaching Literacy in the Visible Learning Classroom: guided reading, reciprocal teaching, fishbowl, gallery walks, and interactive and shared writing.

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

4. Engage students in interactive read-aloud with teacher-modeled think-aloud's demonstrating effective reading processes.. Provide support for teachers to build a shared understandings and appropriate applications of cognitive strategies for reading during interactive reading.

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

5. To scaffold student text comprehension, teachers will design and implement text-dependent questions according to Fisher and Frey's TDQ design process.

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

6. The following practices will be engaged daily during ELA instruction:
- A. Build background knowledge to enhance vocabulary and subject knowledge
 - B. Explicit vocabulary instruction
 - C. Differentiated small-group reading instruction
 - D. Writing in response to reading across subject areas

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

7. Provide tutoring and remediation after school and during Saturday School

Person Responsible Randy Stowers (stowersr@manateeschools.net)

8. Success of this plan will be monitored by analyzing results of common formative assessments including I-ready diagnostic results, County Benchmark assessments and classroom walk-through's.

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

9. Instruction will be adapted for whole, small group, tutoring groups and tier 2 and 3 students according to data results (i-Ready, MindPlay, Next Step to Guided Reading, supplemental teacher identified assessments)

Person Responsible Pat Stream (streamp@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The second area of focus is increasing Science Achievement and student understanding and use of science processes and skills as well as Science content knowledge. This was identified as a critical need from the data review as it is our lowest area of achievement according to the data. Students lack vocabulary, content reading skills, and knowledge of science processes and skills.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2021 school year, students will increase their science proficiency as measured by at least 40% of students scoring proficient on the FSA and FSAA Science Tests.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Randy Stowers (stowersr@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: If we engage in the Learning Focused Framework to include the following high yield strategies:

1. identifying similarities and differences
2. summarizing and note-taking
3. cooperative learning
4. non-linguistic representations
5. setting objectives and providing feedback
6. generating and testing hypotheses

then, Students will increase their science proficiency as measured by 40% or higher of students scoring proficient on the FSA/FSAA Science Test by the end of the 2020 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Marzano, Hattie, and Thompson describe these as strategies that will help a students learn more effectively. The Learning Focused Framework incorporates all of these high yield strategies in each lesson.

Action Steps to Implement

Will will engage in and monitor the following planning and PD processes:

1. We will plan instruction weekly using backwards, standards based planning practices with the Learning Focused Framework
2. We will monitor implementation of plans in the classroom.
3. We will plan PD according to teacher and student needs as identified by walk-throughs and student work samples.

Person Responsible Randy Stowers (stowersr@manateeschools.net)

Teachers will implement the following best practices in Science instruction:

1. Build background knowledge of Science content
2. Engage in teaching content area reading strategies using think-aloud modeling, dialogic activities for students and use of TDQs to deepen comprehension.
3. Engage in daily explicit vocabulary instruction
4. Plan and implement hands-on experiments to refine student knowledge and use of scientific processes and skills, as well as to deepen their understanding of science content knowledge.

Person Responsible Randy Stowers (stowersr@manateeschools.net)

We will engage in the following assessment and monitoring activities:

1. Teachers will assess standards-based instruction weekly using common formative assessments.
2. Analyze data in PLC and adjust instruction as the data indicate is necessary.
3. Monitor success of the plan by analyzing results of common formative assessments, County Benchmark Assessments, walk-throughs, and analysis of student artifacts.
4. Adjust instruction as the data indicates is necessary for whole group, small group and tier 2 and 3 students.

Person Responsible Randy Stowers (stowersr@manateeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Description of this Area of Focus:

According to the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL), Social emotional learning includes five core competencies:

- 1) self-awareness
- 2) self-management
- 3) social awareness
- 4) relationship skills
- 5) responsible decision-making

RGB Staff will learn the SEL competencies and the importance of Social Emotional Learning. Teachers will explicitly teach social emotion skills and strategies using the PurposeFuLL People PreK-12 component of the Character Strong Curriculum.

How does SEL impact student learning?

In a review of over 213 research studies, CASEL found that there is an 11 percentile-point gain in student achievement among students who participated in SEL programs.

According to an article written by Roger Weissburg in Edutopia.org:

"The Short- and Long-Term Benefits of SEL

Students are more successful in school and daily life when they:

- 1* Know and can manage themselves (self-regulation)
- 2* Understand the perspectives of others and relate effectively with them (interpersonal skills)
- 3* Make sound choices about personal and social decisions (responsible decision-making)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

These social and emotional skills are some of several short-term student outcomes that SEL programs promote (Durlak et al., 2011; Farrington et al., 2012; Sklad et al., 2012).

Other benefits include:

1. More positive attitudes toward oneself, others, and tasks including enhanced self-efficacy, confidence, persistence, empathy, connection and commitment to school, and a sense of purpose
2. More positive social behaviors and relationships with peers and adults
3. Reduced conduct problems and risk-taking behavior
4. Decreased emotional distress
5. Improved test scores, grades, and attendance

In the long run, greater social and emotional competence can increase the likelihood of high school graduation, readiness for postsecondary education, career success, positive family and work relationships, better mental health, reduced criminal behavior, and engaged citizenship (e.g., Hawkins, Kosterman, Catalano, Hill, & Abbott, 2008; Jones, Greenberg, & Crowley, 2015).

Rational for why this is a critical need:

Students need to be in the classroom learning with high levels of cognitive engagement. If they are serving Out-of-School Suspension, they are absent and missing critical learning time. If they are serving In-School Suspension, or receiving referrals for inappropriate behavior, their emotions are elevated which prevents learning from occurring and are additional missing critical instruction and learning time.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 2021 school year, out of school suspensions will decrease by 10% or more and the number of referrals written for inappropriate behavior will decrease by at least 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Livia Forrest (forrestl@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rogers Garden Bullock Elementary will implement the PurposeFULL People toolkit, the elementary component of the Character Strong SEL program, to explicitly teach and monitor social-emotional learning goals. PurposeFULL People, a component of Character Strong designed for PreK-5th grade, is a district-adopted program being piloted at schools which have chosen engage with the cohort.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Character Strong's PurposeFULL People was selected by Manatee County to pilot as a comprehensive social emotional learning curriculum in grades K-5. According to the Character strong website: "CharacterStrong meets the latter definition of evidence-based, as the practices and content infused throughout it were carefully selected as common elements of effective practice that research has causally linked to improved social, emotional, and behavioral outcomes at school-wide and individual student levels. CharacterStrong was built upon the premise that the delivery of evidence-based practices depends on evidence-based implementation. Considering this, CharacterStrong possesses two levels of evidentiary support:
(1) Inclusion of evidence-based implementation strategies and
(2) Inclusion of evidence-based practices."

Action Steps to Implement

1. After training for the leadership team, the PurposeFULL People Character Strong Leadership team will meet monthly with the early implementers' team which is comprised of representatives from each grade level and school leadership to identify implementation goals and to reflect on implementation experiences. The Early Implementers will serve as advocates on the RGB staff and will provide information to team members about program components.

Person Responsible

Livia Forrest (forrestl@manateeschools.net)

2. Committee members will provide information and guidance for their grade-level teams to support implementation of PurposeFULL People's lessons and appropriate application of related resources for effective explicit teaching toward each month's goal.

Person Responsible

Livia Forrest (forrestl@manateeschools.net)

3. Teachers will explicitly teach the PurposeFULL People character trait focus for the month to their students. Teachers utilize related literature to extend discussion and facilitate student dialogue related to each trait. Teachers will emphasize self-regulatory behaviors providing students with alternative courses of action when facing challenges or frustration. Targeted lessons for the whole staff and additional lessons for early implementers will be made available through RGB's PurposeFull People Schoology Group.

Person Responsible

Livia Forrest (forrestl@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will continue to work on increasing daily attendance through the collaborative work of our family involvement team, GET, admin team and SAC.

We will continue to work on increasing family involvement through the collaborative work of our family involvement team and SAC.

We will continue working on increasing student writing proficiency by providing a solid base of writing in grades

K-2 implementing and monitoring the success of the program "Becoming a Writer. "

We will continue increasing math proficiency and growth for all students using ACALETICS, as a spiral review, as well as engaging in standards-based core instruction, differentiated instruction and after school and Saturday School tutoring for our students.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Upon reviewing our Title 1 survey and through discussion with our teacher leaders, a need we had for the climate and culture of our school was to define shared leadership and create expectations and a shared vision for students, staff and admin. We are working to create leadership expectations/norms within our school. We began this summer by holding a 4 day Leadership Workshop, which included creating norms and expectations for behaviors within our building. The norms we created through shared visioning were;

Values we hold for Shared Leadership:

- x Risk-taking
- x Humility
- x Trust and trustworthiness
- x Deep listening
- x Respect
- x Building collective capacity
- x Valuing different representations of leadership
- x Knowing different strengths and building on them
- x Being a cheerleader
- x Always considering the interests of the community as a whole before personal interests
- x Flexibility

- × Empathy and building on renewed understandings
- × Being cognizant of your words× Support teachers and students pursuing passions
- × Make support for others a cultural norm
- × Build and maintain relationships with intentionality
- × Clarity of mission – all through the year
- × High expectations of ourselves and our students
- × Leadership is shared among all staff
- × Build the leadership capacities among our students (Leader in Me suggested)
- × Equal investment.
- x Equal ownership

How will we enact our values for Shared Leadership:

- ? Self-asses asking, What are my strengths? and What are my goals?
- ? Checklist for ongoing review and re commitment
- ? Lead by example
- ? Hold ourselves and others accountable
- ? Character Education lesson (relationships first)
- ? Communicate with clarity

How will we maintain our commitment to the values for shared leadership:

- ? Launch team leader meetings with shared leadership focus
- ? Share success stories in team leader meetings and in other venues
- ? Synthesize the list of values to 5 or so
- ? Team building activities embedded in PD sessions, meetings, etc. (for students, too)
- ? Starts with example setting

THE PFEP is attached. It will be modified throughout the year and will be flexible in its delivery due to COVID-19.

For example, in-person events re not possible at the moment because we are limiting access to the campus, so events and meetings will be virtual until such time as these restrictions can be safely lifted.

Budget Note: The TSSSA Budget and Plan are approved and published below this document on the website.

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: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00