

Manatee County Public Schools

Robert H. Prine Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Prine Elementary School

3801 SOUTHERN PKWY W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

Demographics

Principal: Greg Sander

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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 (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert H. Prine Elementary School

3801 SOUTHERN PKWY W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

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	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Prine Elementary provides a balanced, enriched curriculum designed to successfully guide children through the 21st century. Our students prepare for life and academic success by participating in a strong, traditional program which incorporates the arts, enrichment and remediation programs. It is through this effort, and with the support and input from the Prine Family Foundation, that we are able to achieve a high standard of excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prine Elementary sets high standards for learning and celebrates the achievement of every child.

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
Menard, Lynne	Principal	All duties as described by the Superintendent
Flynn, Scott	Assistant Principal	
Moore, Amy	Instructional Media	
Mitchell, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Bolduc, Genevieve	Teacher, K-12	
Carey, Christy	Dean	Assist with student behavior, provide behavior management support and instructional support to teachers.
Crosby, Lauren	Teacher, K-12	
Jenkins, Nancy	Teacher, K-12	
Legowski, Tara	Teacher, PreK	
Lima, Fernanda	Teacher, K-12	
Townsend, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Swenson, Paula	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Greg Sander

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.*

1

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

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 (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (39%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	116	97	117	116	108	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	16	12	1	8	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/1/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	42	42	37	45	46	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242
One or more suspensions	2	2	6	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	17	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	2	6	17	21	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	35%	52%	57%	35%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	57%	58%	40%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	55%	53%	37%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	45%	63%	63%	48%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	68%	62%	46%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	53%	51%	34%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	26%	48%	53%	32%	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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
	2018	34%	49%	-15%	57%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	56%	-15%	58%	-17%
	2018	30%	51%	-21%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	33%	52%	-19%	56%	-23%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	37%	60%	-23%	62%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	62%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	44%	65%	-21%	64%	-20%
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	50%	60%	-10%	60%	-10%
	2018	42%	58%	-16%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	26%	48%	-22%	53%	-27%
	2018	37%	49%	-12%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	19	58	52	17	38	33	9				
ELL	17	37	31	34	49	29	9				
BLK	25	56	45	37	47	40	14				
HSP	31	45	42	45	56	28	19				
WHT	48	65	73	53	67	47	46				
FRL	32	52	53	41	56	33	21				
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	18	45	47	27	48	41	18				
ELL	22	48	50	36	53	50	9				
BLK	20	53	60	35	61		25				
HSP	30	47	50	41	51	47	24				
MUL	73			55							
WHT	52	60		64	61	42	59				
FRL	34	50	54	45	56	48	34				

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	17	33	37	25	28	17	14				
ELL	18	30	37	36	37	36	11				
BLK	27	34		42	52		35				
HSP	24	34	31	38	37	30	15				
MUL	50	45		57	73						
WHT	53	48	54	64	54	31	64				
FRL	31	36	33	45	45	31	28				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	356
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
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	61
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	43
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.

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (33%) and Science Achievement (26%). No, this is not a trend. We increased 14 percentage points in math lowest quartile gains from 34% to 48% from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 and decreased 15 percentage points in 2018-2019. We increased 7 percentage points in science achievement from 2016-2017 and decreased 13 percentage points in 2018-2019.

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

The data shows that the Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains showed the greatest decline with 15 percentage points.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average (26% school, 53% state - difference of 27%). The science assessment relies heavily on a reading component. Our school has a high population of ELL students (over 200) as well as a large population of economically disadvantaged students. These students enter school with large gaps in their reading abilities (multiple grade level deficits) in vocabulary, decoding, and phonological awareness which is a contributing factor to lower performance levels on the science assessment.

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

Math learning gains (56% to 57%). Yes this is a trend. We used Acaletics math in grades 3-5. We administered the quarterly benchmark assessments and tracked the data and monitored the students progress toward proficiency. We also analyzed the assessment data to create targeted standards-based lesson for our students. We also had our teachers meet with the district math instructional specialist to create rigorous, standards-based lessons targeted areas of low student achievement levels.

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

There are two areas of concern when reflecting on the EWS data. The first area of concern is students with low attendance (116 - whole school). Last year we had 68 students in grades 3-5 whose attendance was below 90 percent. The second area of concern is students with suspensions (126 - whole school). In grades 3-5 there were 62 students with suspensions. Both of these areas result in students missing instruction which contributes to the large academic deficits that already had. Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide

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

1. Math Lowest Quartile Gains
2. Science Achievement
3. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
4. Reading Achievement
5. Math Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Trend data is demonstrating that Math proficiency is low.

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year based on FSA Math data for grades 3-5 we will have 45% achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase Standards-based instruction in math in order to increase performance of Students with Disabilities, ELL, Hispanic, and Black/ African American.

Math Achievement on FSA: 50%
Math Gains: 65%
Math L25: 65%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynne Menard (menardl@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Implemented data wall and spreadsheet system in grades 3-5 to monitor student growth and progress in the areas of proficiency, Federal Index areas of concern, and L25 students.
- Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
- Common formative and summative assessments
- District Quarterly Benchmark assessments
- i-Ready diagnostic and growth checks
- Acaletics (3-5) No Walk-to-Learn until COVID is gone.
- Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
- Small Group instruction based on our sub-group data
- ELL Resource teacher and ELL Specialist work with teachers on strategies for ELL students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement levels in Math will improve on the FSA when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum map and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet weekly to collaboratively participate in a Standards-based planning session.
2. Student common formative and summative assessment data will be monitored and adjustments to planning and instruction will be made based on this data.
3. Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
4. Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
5. Data wall and spreadsheet system in grades 3-5 to monitor student growth and progress in the areas of proficiency, Federal Index areas of concern, and L25 students.

Prior to the shift to eLearning due to COVID-19 using our district benchmark assessments the SDMC Assesment and Accountability department projected our school grade to be a 50% C. Using an FSA Simulation Score conducted by the SDMC Aassessment and Accountability depatrmenty our school grade

was projected to score a 53% C. This evidence supports that our action plan was making a positive impact in our identified targeted areas.

Person
Responsible Lynne Menard (menardl@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Trend data is demonstrating that ELA proficiency is low.

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year based on FSA ELA data for grades 3-5 we will have 45% achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

Increase Standards-based instruction in ELA in order to increase performance of Students with Disabilities, ELL, Hispanic, and Black/ African American.

ELA Achievement on FSA: 45%

ELA Gains: 65%

ELA L25: 65%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynne Menard (menardl@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Implemented data wall and spreadsheet system in grades 3-5 to monitor student growth and progress in the areas of proficiency, Federal Index areas of concern, and L25 students.
- Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
- Common formative and summative assessments
- District Quarterly Benchmark assessments
- i-Ready diagnostic and growth checks
- MindPlay (K-5)
- Club ExcEL (3-5)
- Imagine Learning (K-5)
- Next Step Forward in Guided Reading (K-2)
- Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
- Small Group instruction based on our sub-group data
- ELL Resource teacher and ELL Specialist work with teachers on strategies for ELL students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement levels in ELA will improve on the FSA when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum maps and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet weekly to collaboratively participate in a Standards-based planning session.
2. Student common formative and summative assessment data will be monitored and adjustments to planning and instruction will be made based on this data.
3. Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
4. Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
5. Data wall and spreadsheet system in grades 3-5 to monitor student growth and progress in the areas of proficiency, Federal Index areas of concern, and L25 students.

Prior to the shift to eLearning due to COVID-19 using our district benchmark assessments the SDMC

Assesment and Accountability department projected our school grade to be a 50% C. Using an FSA Simulation Score conducted by the SDMC Asessment and Accountability depatrmenty our school grade was projected to score a 53% C. This evidence supports that our action plan was making a positive impact in our identified targeted areas.

Person
Responsible Lynne Menard (menardl@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Trend data is demonstrating that Science proficiency is low.

By the end of the 2020-2021 school year based on FSA Science data for grades 3-5 we will have 45% achievement.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Standards-based instruction in science in order to increase performance of Students with Disabilities, ELL, Hispanic, and Black/African American.

Science Achievement on FSA: 45%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lynne Menard (menardl@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Implemented data wall and spreadsheet system in grades 3-5 to monitor student growth and progress in the areas of proficiency, Federal Index areas of concern, and L25 students.
- Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
- Common formative and summative assessments
- District Quarterly Benchmark assessments
- SRA (K-5)
- Imagine Learning (K-5)
- Acaletics Science (5)
- Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
- Nearpod EL Lessons (K-5)
- ELL Resource teacher and ELL Specialist work with teachers on strategies for ELL students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement levels in Science will improve on the FSA when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum map and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will meet weekly to collaboratively participate in a Standards-based planning session.
2. Student common formative and summative assessment data will be monitored and adjustments to planning and instruction will be made based on this data.
3. Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
4. Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
5. Data wall and spreadsheet system in grades 3-5 to monitor student growth and progress in the areas of proficiency, Federal Index areas of concern, and L25 students.

Prior to the shift to eLearning due to COVID-19 using our district benchmark assessments the SDMC Assesment and Accountability department projected our school grade to be a 50% C. Using an FSA Simulation Score conducted by the SDMC Aassessment and Accountability depatrmenty our school grade

was projected to score a 53% C. This evidence supports that our action plan was making a positive impact in our identified targeted areas.

Person Responsible Lynne Menard (menardl@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We conducted a book study using the text Hacking School Discipline. This text covers many different tactics that take root in Trauma Informed practices, Restorative Justice, Responsive Classroom, Growth Mindset, Mindfulness, Mediation, and community building. We also have hosted and will continue to host monthly professional development with local experts in these different areas to further teachers knowledge and understanding of challenging student behavior.

Teachers hold a daily morning meeting following the structure from Responsive classroom to help gauge students mental state and grow and strengthen the classroom community (peer to peer and peer to teacher). When student conflict occurs (peer to peer or student to staff) mediation practices from Restorative Justice are used to help resolve conflict. Teachers utilize Growth Mindset language and goal setting with students during data chats and daily instruction. Each class does mindful breathing daily (usually during Morning Meeting but also coming back from transitions or other scenarios when needed) and has a Peace/Calm Corner that students can use when their emotions are becoming too strong and hard to manage.

Additionally we use a school-wide PBIS program which uses positive rewards to help encourage and teach students to demonstrate our school-wide behavior expectations.

Our goal is use multiple trauma informed practices such as increasing a sense of community within the classroom, checking in daily with students, teaching mindfulness practices to help students learn to regulate their emotions appropriately, using Growth Mindset practices to create a paradigm shift within our students, mediating conflict and using restorative justice practices will help reduce referrals and suspensions of students.

We have a Graduation Enhancement Technician (GET) that helps to track student attendance. She conducts home visits and tries to connect families with services and support that they need (i.e. school supplies, property management, uniforms, bus passes, etc.) to help improve student attendance. The GET also does a "Check and Connect" program where she checks on high-risk attendance students and works on building relationships with the students and provides incentives for students who make attendance goals.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

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

We will build strong relationships from the beginning of the year and sustain those relationships throughout the year. Some of the things we will be implementing this year are:

Parent Portal through FOCUS

Open House (Virtual)

Prine Facebook Page

School Website

Schoology (parent and student access)

Family Events (Literacy Night, Math and STEM Night, Breakfast with Santa). These will be held in a virtual platform due to COVID-19.

Parent Conferences (held virtually during COVID-19)

Progress Reports

Blackboard ConnectEd

Meetings (SAC, PFF) (held virtually during COVID-19)

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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