

Manatee County Public Schools

Sea Breeze Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	0

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

Demographics

Principal: Alik Bovoletis

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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

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	0

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

School Grades History

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

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.

a. Provide the school's mission statement.

Sea Breeze Elementary School strives to maintain high expectations and promote academic excellence for all students by creating a positive school climate which respects and values diversity and nurtures self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sea Breeze Elementary School is a place where students can develop academically, personally, physically and socially so that they may be productive and active members of the United States democracy, its economy, and the global society in which they live. To this end, education at Sea Breeze is a collaborative effort between the students, their parents—the child's first and foremost teachers—the school, and the community.

A critical role of education will be to help develop students' abilities to be learners throughout their lives so that they will possess the skills to adapt to an ever-changing world. The standards set forth by the State of Florida will serve as the foundation for learning so that students attain a well-balanced education consisting of not only academic skills but also skills in the areas of art, personal and physical well-being, technology and civic responsibility.

Within the school, teachers and staff will collaborate to create a warm, friendly, safe and challenging environment for students to grow. Staff will serve as models for our students as they work together to continuously improve their skills and their school. Teachers will collaborate to clearly define quality student work and design equal opportunities so that all students can rise to meet high expectations of learning. Student progress will be tracked and monitored so teachers can make informed instructional decisions to support the ongoing academic achievement of our students. Ongoing professional development and collaboration will be a staple of Sea Breeze Elementary School so that all staff continuously develop and maintain the skills necessary for all students to be successful.

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
Sander, Greg	Principal	
Cook, Deborah	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/12/2020, Aliki Bovoletis

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

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 (49%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	80	83	80	82	60	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	6	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	6	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	76	81	88	73	75	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	76	81	88	73	75	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	19	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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	50%	52%	57%	57%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	57%	58%	65%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	55%	53%	59%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	56%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	52%	68%	62%	69%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	29%	53%	51%	63%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	48%	48%	53%	55%	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	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	56%	-9%	58%	-11%
	2018	44%	51%	-7%	56%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	46%	52%	-6%	56%	-10%
	2018	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	65%	-14%	64%	-13%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	42%	48%	-6%	53%	-11%
	2018	49%	49%	0%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	44	50	40	49	29	35				
ELL	34	50	65	48	50	36	29				
BLK	40	51	54	48	33	16	38				
HSP	43	52	58	49	52	42	36				
MUL	53	55		65	55						
WHT	57	51	60	69	60	27	57				
FRL	46	48	51	56	50	31	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	27	49	43	35	49	40	20				
ELL	17	44	36	37	72	55					
BLK	42	64	56	40	54	56	52				
HSP	30	41	40	56	63	55	40				
MUL	56	83		76	82						
WHT	61	54	36	74	77	38	59				
FRL	44	54	47	60	69	53	53				

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	21	46	53	31	57	50	29				
ELL	32	52	50	34	48	47	27				
BLK	44	62		39	76	73	36				
HSP	54	67	56	48	67	55	43				
MUL	78			71							
WHT	58	65	64	61	68	70	65				
FRL	51	64	56	49	68	64	49				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	421
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	48
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	40
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	51
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	57
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	54
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	51
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.

5th grade science 42%. Sea Breeze lost 2 high impact science teacher and were replaced with 1st year teachers. There was a lot of time and effort spent on behavior management rather than science vocabulary

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

4th grade math 51% school-64%state)-14%-Sea Breeze lost 3 4th grade teachers after the year began and were replaced with 1st year teachers in January. Switching classes create too many transitions and lost instructional time. Interventions, while attempted, did not create learning gains.

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

4th grade math 51% school-64%state)-14%--Sea Breeze lost 3 4th grade teachers after the year began and were replaced with 1st year teachers in January. Switching classes create too many transitions and lost instructional time. Interventions, while attempted, did not create learning gains.

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

3rd grade math- 17-18 55%-18-19-60%-Every class out performed in math compared to reading. There was an emphasis on foundation skills and standard based instruction

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

The biggest concern is that the learning gains and L25 is almost entirely based on 5th graders (and some retained students). And there are currently 30 elearning students.

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

1. Math learning gains + L25
2. ELA learning gains + L25
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SRA will be implemented this year. SRA Mastery will be provided in grades K-3/ bottom quartile. SRA Corrective Reading will be provided in grades 4-5/bottom 25%..
Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains in bottom 25% will be 62% on the 20-21 FSA ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SRA Mastery and SRA Corrective Reading are supported by the district.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	SRA have been proven to increase improvement in reading and is also recommended by the district. SRA was implemented last year in our third grade Academy class with students learning gains increasing significantly.
Action Steps to Implement	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Train teachers on SRA Mastery in grades K-3 and SRA Corrective in grades 4-5. 2. Offer intervention support for implementing SRA in the classrooms. 3. Conduct check-ins with teachers to make sure the program is being implemented with fidelity. 4. Conduct progress monitoring bi-weekly for students completing the SRA program 	
Person Responsible	Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Sea Breeze had 29 % of student made learning gains in math bottom 25% in the 18-19 FSA.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains in bottom 25% will be 62% on the 20-21 FSA Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement Acaletics in 5th, 4th, 3rd, and 2nd grade class. Teachers will implement the spiral curriculum with fidelity, and will have district Title 1 support to model and coach teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Last year, 7 out of 7 students in the 3rd grade academy class made a learning and 4 moved to proficiency. We will use Title 1 resource personnel to help implement the program.

Action Steps to Implement

1. purchase Acaletics
2. have teachers view video of Acaletics being implemented
3. start the program-Practice instructional routines
4. provide coaching and feedback
5. level groups based on student results...Covid allowing

Person Responsible Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We currently focusing on the interventions in 3 A

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.

Building positive school culture is something I have been working on for the five years I have been at Sea Breeze Elementary. The way we define ourselves and the attributes we look for when hiring are...1. Nice 2. Learner 3. Positive impact on students and school community. That has helped create an environment of positive partnerships. Over the summer we had approx. 7 voluntary Teams meeting with staff about the opening plan and there was ~50 staff members per session. We received positive suggestions and feedback from the staff who is going to be most impacted by the decision. We also made many calls to parents over the summer about learning options, and found it was a wonderful way to build relationships. Parents are scared and nervous. This year we are going 100% Classroom Dojo for parent communication. It has been growing at our school every year with great success. Since we can't have in person events right now, we are stressing the parent communication, class pictures, class videos through the Classroom Dojo app. This will help keep the home school relationship strong.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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