

Manatee County Public Schools

# Gilbert W Mcneal Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Gilbert W Mcneal Elementary School

6325 LORRAINE RD, Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Sheila Waid**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (63%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Gilbert W Mcneal Elementary School

6325 LORRAINE RD, Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202

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

### 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	No	18%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.

Gilbert W. McNeal is a school attuned to inspire minds and celebrate learning. FULL STEAM AHEAD has been our focus and vision for four years. Our mantra is: I will be respectful, I will be responsible, and I will be wild about learning. We have integrated technology in every aspect of instruction. We are continuing our work in empowering leadership and strengthening our school culture and climate. We will continue our "Leader and Me" journey with continued training during the 2020-2021 school year. These last two years we embarked on the 7 Habits of Happy Kids by Sean Covey to enhance our school climate and culture. We strive to empower our students as they will become McNeal Wildcat Leaders and utilize Data Binders and participate in creating action teams and write Wildly Important Goals (WIGS).

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee County Public Schools will be an exemplary student-focused school system that develops lifelong learners to be globally competitive. Gilbert W. McNeal is a STEAM school where integration of Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math are a focus. Full STEAM Ahead: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be WILD about Learning! is our school theme this year. We are in our second year as a Leader and Me Covey school during the 2019-2020 school year. Our mantra is: I will be respectful, I will be responsible, and I will be wild about learning. We have integrated technology in every aspect of instruction. We are continuing our work in empowering leadership and strengthening our school culture and climate. Our Motto for this year is: Wildcat Leaders are Action Minded!

### 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
McGrew, Cheryl	Principal	Provide instructional leadership while providing a safe learning environment for all students! To provide professional development and resources for all staff to improve instruction to meet the needs of all students. To provide data and data monitoring of students and instruction to ensure growth of all students. To serve on our SAC at McNeal and collaborate with all SAC members.
lander, alice	Teacher, K-12	
Smart, Kelly	Instructional Media	
Dubendorg, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Grant, David	Dean	
Laport, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Manfredi, Amber	Teacher, K-12	
Padgett, Nancy Alex	School Counselor	
Spence, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Craig, Nichole	Teacher, K-12	SAC teacher representative/ 2nd Grade Teacher
Terry, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Review and Monitor Data as well as IST.

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 8/12/2020, Sheila Waid

**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.*

4

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

42



**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	21%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (63%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	86	91	105	103	98	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	605
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	3	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	13	6	4	9	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
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**

Wednesday 8/12/2020

**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	100	118	120	120	130	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	718	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	13	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	

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

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

**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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	100	118	120	120	130	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	718
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	13	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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

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

**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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	79%	52%	57%	76%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	74%	57%	58%	66%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	55%	53%	41%	53%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	78%	63%	63%	79%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	68%	62%	68%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	53%	51%	46%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	72%	48%	53%	61%	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	75%	51%	24%	58%	17%
	2018	68%	49%	19%	57%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	76%	56%	20%	58%	18%
	2018	80%	51%	29%	56%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	82%	52%	30%	56%	26%
	2018	76%	52%	24%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	60%	10%	62%	8%
	2018	68%	56%	12%	62%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	65%	19%	64%	20%
	2018	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	79%	60%	19%	60%	19%
	2018	78%	58%	20%	61%	17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	48%	23%	53%	18%
	2018	70%	49%	21%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

### Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	48	60	52	49	63	56	33				
ELL	24	41	44	41	62	68					
ASN	100			100							
BLK	69			62							
HSP	41	55	45	55	68	68	46				
WHT	89	81	67	86	76	47	79				
FRL	49	54	44	56	65	58	44				
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	49	69	53	45	70	65	47				
ELL	19	54	48	26	50	47					
ASN	83	70		100	90						
HSP	46	69	57	47	55	40	46				
MUL	90			70							
WHT	83	70	56	86	74	58	77				
FRL	51	60	48	62	54	48	52				
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	51	42	25	60	58	38	45				
ELL	17	46	42	26	60	55	27				
ASN	100	83		100	83						
HSP	41	45	36	56	65	62	40				
MUL	85	50		54	30						
WHT	83	71	48	84	69	35	67				

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
FRL	47	53	36	53	57	48	34				

### 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	68
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	545
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	43
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	100
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Based on data from 2 years ago our data indicated our areas of focus will be ELA in the lowest 25th as the data showed a drop of 2%. The data also showed a decrease of 1% in the lowest 25th in MATH. We also noted our SWD sub group dropped 1 point in ELA. There is a achievement gap of

black and white students. There is a 20 point gap in ELA and a 21 point gap in MATH. We realize this data is 2 year old data and plan to assess and analyze our iReady and classroom assessments in September upon completion.

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

There was not a significant decline in any area. Our ELL sub group improved by 5 points in ELA. The biggest decline in 2% in lowest quartile in ELA and the SWD sub group of 1%. We have lost our sub group of Migrant students this year to a district move to another school. We will need to analyze our student data with that in mind. We will focus on scores from last year to create learning goals of all of our learners.

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

We outperformed the district and state in all categories except the lowest quartile in ELA. We continued our data meetings as well as data binders with monthly review of data. We provided an additional resource in 3rd and 4th grade to support our lowest quartile as well. We believe our newly acquired training of 2 resource teachers in Orton-Gillingham will provide more specific and focused support for our lowest quartile in ELA.

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

Our ELL sub group increased 5 points in ELA proficiency. We believe the small group instruction as well as leveled reading groups with support helped our ELL students. We also provided mentors from our community and this added a layer of support.

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

Our ELL sub group has moved from McNeal to Myakka City this year. We will continue raising rigor with support of our ELL students this year. We highly encourage inclusion to raise the rigor while supporting our ESE students with accommodations for our learners.

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

1. ELA and Math Learning Gains for lowest 25th.
2. Science Proficiency for 5th grade.
3. ELA and Math Proficiency
4. Culture and Community Improvement

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:



**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Application of focused walk through practices as learned during the Brian Dasslar Leadership Academy completed last year. Myself and my assistant principal hosted a session as well. We plan on applying the research based strategy of focused walks with time to analyze and provide important feedback. Our staff will utilize the feedback to improve classroom instruction and environment. We will align data with our walks as well as observations. The ELA strategies used will be identified as a focus. We will identify and focus on areas that are identified by our data and show a weakness of deficit.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The administration team will work with staff to create a clear focus and will provide clear feedback with teaching staff to help improve instruction and environment as evidenced by 2% increase in ELA proficiency and 5% of lowest 25th. Additional instructional plans will be implemented as needed.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Cheryl McGrew (mcgrewc@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will used a Focus based strategy learned in the Brian Dasslar Leadership Academy before any walks or observations are conducted. The research is based on 2019 University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership. The foundational Ideas are based on common language for high-quality instruction and knowing how to lead for that. There are four dimensions of instructional leadership. Vision/Mission, Improvement of Instructional Practice, Allocation of Resources, and Management of systems and processes. Our leadership team and staff will work to create focused walks and press for evidence without judgement but with the intent of improved instruction and student learning.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Brain Dasslar Leadership Materials obtained in Leadership Academy as well as cohort walks. Targeted feedback cycles create purpose such as focus and creates outcomes for observations and conversations. Teacher and leader work together to decide when evidence is related to area of focus. Feedback is based on collaborative conversations with instruction and student learning as the context with factual feedback. (What you see and hear) We also invested in training in Orton-Gillingham over the summer with our two ESE resource teachers. Resources: SRA, iReady, Trade Books, AR comprehension tests, Promethean Boards, Spalding Phonemic Awareness, Top Score, STEAM integrated classes.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Staff and leadership with set Areas of Focus using ELA proficiency and lowest 25th of school data in ELA.
2. In this population we will determine what areas of focus we will determine to be most important.
3. Create a plan to target strategies and instructional shifts for this population.
4. Gather and analyze data monthly. Access iReady results by grade level. Admin will meet with grade level teams to place students in Tier 2 or 3 based on data. Interventions and strategies will be discussed and monitoring will begin using a set of determined tools.
5. Update strategies and groups as needed and evidenced by student data.

**Person Responsible** Cheryl McGrew (mcgrewc@manateeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Application of focused walk through practices as learned during the Brian Dasslar Leadership Academy completed last year. Myself and my assistant principal hosted a session as well. We plan on applying the research based strategy of focused walks with time to analyze and provide important feedback. Our staff will utilize the feedback to improve classroom instruction and environment.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The administration team will work with staff to create a clear focus. Once that is established our team will provide clear feedback with teaching staff to help improve instruction and environment as evidenced by a 2% increase in MATH proficiency and 5% in MATH lowest 25%. Plans will be implemented as needed.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Cheryl McGrew (mcgrewc@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will used a Focus based strategy learned in the Brian Dasslar Leadership Academy before any walk through or observations are conducted. The research is based on 2019 University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership. The foundational Ideas are based on common language for high-quality instruction and knowing how to lead for that. There are four dimensions of instructional leadership. Vision/Mission, Improvement of Instructional Practice, Allocation of Resources, and Management of systems and processes. Our leadership team and staff will work to create focused walks and press for evidence without judgement but with the intent of improved instruction and student learning.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Brain Dasslar Leadership Materials obtained in Leadership Academy as well as cohort walks. Targeted feedback cycles create purpose such as focus and creates outcomes for observations and conversations. Teacher and leader work together to decide when evidence is related to area of focus. Feedback is based on collaborative conversations with instruction and student learning as the context with factual feedback. (What you see and hear)

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Staff and leadership with set Areas of Focus using MATH proficiency and lowest 25th of school data in MATH.
  2. Using our current data we will determine what areas of focus we will determine to be most important.
  3. Create a plan to target strategies and instructional shifts for learning area as well as the population of the lowest 25th in math.
  4. Gather and analyze data monthly.
  5. Update strategies and groups as needed and evidenced by student data.
- Resources: Promethean Boards, STEAM integrated classes. Gifted inclusion, STEAM and Engineering Lab.

**Person Responsible** Cheryl McGrew (mcgrewc@manateeschools.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports****Area of****Focus**

1. Number of outbursts and referrals

**Description  
and  
Rationale:**

2. Number of restraints of ESE students

**Measurable  
Outcome:**

McNeal Elementary will reduce our referrals by 5% this year by continuing Leader in Me with focus of Wildcat Leaders are Action Minded. We will continue our Pawsome Program including our Mantra as well as our school shirt. Students will earn iron on emblems to represent each quarter goal.

**Person  
responsible  
for  
monitoring  
outcome:**

David Grant (grantd@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

Leader in Me/ 2019-2020 "Wildcat Leaders are Action Minded!

Mantra: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Wild about Learning!

McNeal Elementary will incorporate the 7 Habits in our school culture. Our staff will review the 7 habits and begin organizing our Peace Day Assembly which will be student run this year. The staff will organize in three areas and start the process of Action Teams for students.

We will work this year to contribute to a student-led Leadership Day at the end of the year. Students will collect and Monitor data as well as Wildly Important Goals (WIGS)

**Rationale  
for  
Evidence-  
based  
Strategy:**

"Leader and Me" is an extension of Stephen Covey's work. His son Sean has accomplished this program by writing a program implementing the 7 Habits into schools across the world. His first work was accomplished at A.B. Combs Elementary. All data and research was gathered originally there. His work expanded to countries all over the world and he completed the second edition of Leader in Me.

**Action Steps to Implement**

WIGS-Staff and students will complete and monitor Wildly Important Goals (WIGS) Staff and students will work with Accountability partner weekly to reflect on WIG.

We are going to have a Virtual Book Cadre for the Leader in Me book that was given to us at the end of last school year! This would be a great opportunity for your PDP!

Action Minded- We want to highlight students who are taking Action at school and outside of school.

Working on an "Action Report" so that students can share what they've accomplished.

We will be modeling the Action Cycle with Peace Day.

We will highlight Teachers and Students on the news that have taken Action!

Goal for the year is to have a LEADERSHIP Day! This will be worked on throughout the year but our hope is to make it Student Led! (Even if it's virtual!)

We will have an Application for Ambassadors that will help our new families and take on leadership roles at McNeal.

Students will earn Iron On Patches for their Leadership!

"W" for writing their WIG each Quarter

Check Mark for when they complete their WIG.

Confetti Emoji for completing the Action Cycle!

Arrow for Action!

Leader of the Week- Ideas shared in Schoology!

Leadership Roles (Instead of jobs)

Allow students to record your phone messages, hang things in the hallway and classroom  
Chant Leaders! (We will have a Youtube Video of the Chant Soon so everyone can learn it!)

Leader in Me Lighthouse School Action Teams

Leadership Team: Representatives/ Martha Ferra, Olivia Swartling

Team Members:

Steven Pippen ,Rose Brand ,Kelly Smart

Culture Team: Representatives: Gwyn Ingham, Betsy Smith, Cris Edwards

Team Members: Kristi Dyer, Lisa LaPort, Lillian Matazinski, Andrea Berninger, Angie Hughes, Jodi Samson, Cara Keenan, Tina Peters, Jessica Spence, Angela Gulbrandsen, Maddie Wilder, Lora Sevarino, Bea Schaeffer, Mindy Swartling

Academic Team: Representatives: Amanda Bertrand, Stacy Freeman

Team Members: Michelle Dubendorf, Alice Lander, Dawn Schmid, Nichole Craig, Beth Davis, Angela Gulbrandsen, Michelle Bennet, Nancy Newby, Jeannine Germer, Amber Manfredi

**Person Responsible** David Grant (grantd@manateeschools.net)

Develop a Sensory Room: It will be called the Wildcat Den. We will provide a safe place for students to choose to enter for a cool down and reset. Mr. Grant and Mrs. Sheffield will work with our behavior specialist to design and implement tools and strategies for a positive outcome.

**Person Responsible** David Grant (grantd@manateeschools.net)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The three Areas of Focus address our priorities as identified in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/ Analysis.**

## 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.

McNeal Elementary has worked over the past 5 years to implement and encourage a positive school culture. We began by having a focus each year and building upon our Mantra: Be Respectful, Be Responsible, and Be Wild About Learning. We established quarterly mentors and read school-wide text to promote these mentors. We organized World Flags to represent our student body. These are located in our cafeteria. We began our journey to become a Leader and Me Lighthouse School. We are entering our second year and have planned the following for this year:

WIGS-Staff and students will complete and monitor Wildly Important Goals (WIGS.) Staff and students will work with their Accountability partner weekly to reflect on their WIG.

We are going to have a Virtual Book Cadre for the Leader in Me book that was given to us at the end of last school year! This would be a great opportunity for your PDP!

Action Minded- We want to highlight students who are taking Action at school and outside of school.

Working on an "Action Report" so that students can share what they've accomplished.

We will be modeling the Action Cycle with Peace Day.

We will highlight Teachers and Students on the news that have taken Action!

Our goal for the year is to have a LEADERSHIP Day! This will be worked on throughout the year but our hope is to make it Student Led! (Even if it's virtual!)

We will have an Application for Ambassadors that will help tour new families and take on leadership roles at McNeal.

Students will earn Iron On Patches for their Leadership!

"W" for writing their WIG each Quarter

Arrow for Action!

Check Mark for when they complete their WIG.

Confetti Emoji for completing the Action Cycle!

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.