Louise R Johnson K 8 School Of International Studies

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Louise R Johnson K 8 School Of International Studies

2121 26TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

https://www.manateeschools.net/lincoln

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Losada

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

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

School Board Approval

This plan 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

Louise R Johnson K 8 School Of International Studies

2121 26TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

https://www.manateeschools.net/lincoln

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)
Combination School KG-8	No	58%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

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.

Mission statement: Our mission is to inspire students to achieve academic excellence, embrace global diversity, and become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision statement: To be a premier International Baccalaureate Programme.

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
Nikitopoulos, Irene	Assistant Principal	
Losada, Anthony (Tony)	Principal	Drop Down Menu need to be updated to reflect merge of both schools.
Clem, Christine	Other	
Berg, Shana	Other	
Kitchner, Jaime	Dean	
Anzelond, Deborah	Dean	
Vos, Adrienne	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 1/7/2019, Anthony Losada

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.*
10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
68

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	64	65	67	84	67	89	157	150	160	0	0	0	0	903
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	12	8	11	10	12	14	11	0	0	0	0	92
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	7	18	9	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	20	13	0	0	0	0	61

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	3	5	7	13	6	0	0	0	0	34

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	8	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/7/2020

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	64	64	76	69	87	89	166	168	157	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	3	1	9	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	3	3	3	8	19	17	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	21	18	30	19	16	0	0	0	0	106

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	2	0	2	1	5	3	12	10	0	0	0	0	35

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	64	64	76	69	87	89	166	168	157	0	0	0	0	940
Attendance below 90 percent	4	6	2	3	1	9	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	1	2	2	3	3	3	8	19	17	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	21	18	30	19	16	0	0	0	0	106

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	2	0	2	1	5	3	12	10	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	72%	58%	61%	67%	55%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	57%	59%	61%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	54%	50%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	82%	64%	62%	73%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	74%	63%	59%	69%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	55%	52%	59%	49%	50%
Science Achievement	73%	54%	56%	63%	48%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	83%	78%	91%	76%	75%

	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
Indicator	**K**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	73%	52%	21%	54%	19%
	2018	70%	47%	23%	52%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				
07	2019	66%	48%	18%	52%	14%
	2018	74%	48%	26%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
	2018	77%	55%	22%	58%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	76%	57%	19%	55%	21%
	2018	85%	52%	33%	52%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		76%				
07	2019	85%	57%	28%	54%	31%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	54%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	69%	41%	28%	46%	23%
	2018	34%	41%	-7%	45%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		35%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	73%	45%	28%	48%	25%
	2018	69%	45%	24%	50%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		73%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	77%	11%	71%	17%
2018	91%	78%	13%	71%	20%
Compare		-3%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	65%	35%	61%	39%
2018	95%	65%	30%	62%	33%
Compare		5%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	56%	44%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	38	65	64	68	67	60					
ELL	40	52	52	61	59	53	33	64	50		
ASN	100	79		100	89						
BLK	51	53	46	65	69	65	38	75	70		
HSP	66	62	56	79	68	60	70	85	58		
MUL	93	79		93	87						
WHT	88	72	50	94	83	83	91	96	76		
FRL	62	59	54	74	68	59	60	82	50		

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	52	44	33	64	64	50	45				
ELL	28	59	56	47	41	41		74			
ASN	92	67		100	88		100		100		
BLK	51	49	47	61	63	56	36	84	81		
HSP	70	64	62	73	61	58	63	91	88		
MUL	87	57		81	64						
WHT	87	64	60	91	75	72	89	91	92		
FRL	64	58	57	69	63	58	57	87	84		

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	44	55	50	55	73	73		71			
ELL	23	36	30	37	57	49	9				
ASN	88	65		100	77			100	100		
BLK	50	55	38	56	65	58	52	79	21		
HSP	58	57	47	65	63	58	45	89	53		
MUL	82	65		82	65						

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
WHT	85	70	87	88	77	67	93	97	82		
FRL	55	56	46	62	62	57	44	87	38		

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	72
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	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	717
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	60
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	54
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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
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	68
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	88
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	81
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	64
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.

The component that showed the lowest performance was the Lower Quartile in L25 in the English Language Arts (ELA) assessment. Administration attributes that the factor that most contributed to this deficiency relates to the introduction of a new Intensive Reading curriculum in SY 18/19 along with a new on-line intervention program. Teachers may have lacked sufficient training regarding best practices and progress monitoring may have not been fully implemented. Focus was placed on the number of lessons being completed rather than the number of lessons completed at proficiency. Additionally, communication of data between the teachers of the Intensive Reading courses and Language Arts courses was infrequent. Lastly, Intensive Reading classes included students in all grade levels rather than students assigned by grade level.

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

The Acceleration component showed the greatest decline from 90% in SY 17/18 to 71% in SY 18/19. Despite having a 100% proficiency rate in Algebra 1 and Geometry, the 19 percentage point difference can be attributed to the reduction of students being enrolled in Algebra 1 as 8th graders. These Level 3 students were scheduled into a Pre-Algebra course as 8th graders instead. Generally, students who scored a Level 4 or 5 on the 7th Grade Mathematics FSA were the only students placed in the Algebra 1 course.

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.

No gaps existed among the school's components and the state average components; however, the school's Lower Quartile in ELA equaled the state average. As described in E1, the deficit can be attributed to limited training of new instructional material, lack of pure grade-level classes, and inadequate grade-level collaboration among teachers.

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

The area of the greatest improvement was Mathematics Learning Gains (9 percentage points) and Mathematics L25 gains (9 percentage points). Actions that contributed to these gains included fidelity to the learning program (I-Ready), data chats among mathematics teachers (including Intensive Math), and push-in small group instruction.

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

One area of concern remains ELL students. Although the data indicates that gains were made by the majority of these students, the proficiency rates between ELL students and their non-ELL/white counterparts ranges from 32 percentage points (Social Studies) to 58 percentage point (Science).

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

1. L25 ELA Students
2. L25 Math Students
3. Acceleration
4. Learning Gains for ELA
5. Learning Gains for Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need by analyzing English Language Arts results for students in Grades 3-8. Infusing evidence-based writing across the curriculum requires students to focus on ideas, organize sequences, and synthesize concepts. All of these skills are essential to demonstrating proficiency not only on the English Language Arts assessment, but also on the Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies state assessments. Additionally, the International Baccalaureate program promotes inquiry across-content areas so students can evaluate and synthesize information from multiple perspectives. This cross-content inquiry leads to students engaging in higher-order thinking skills. Teachers will use collaborative planning groups to incorporate best practices in writing instruction throughout the curriculum. Expert teachers who are highly proficient in high impact instructional approaches that improve student writing technique will lead professional development and collaborative groups to build teacher capacity.
Measurable Outcome:	Through the implementation of writing and inquiry across all content areas, Louise. R. Johnson School of International Studies will achieve an "A" as a combined K-8 school as measured by the State's overall school grade calculation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	IB Curriculum including, collaborative planning, writing cross content and Inquiry based instruction. District researched writing initiative. Being a Writer.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this strategies is evidence-based research conducted by the International Baccalaureate program as well as best practices as recommended by the School District of Manatee County.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Rigorous reading and regular writing assignments will be embedded into all grades in K-5 as well as ELA, Reading, Science, Social Studies, Math and elective classes at the secondary level. 2. Inquiry based lessons will be planned collaboratively and taught throughout all subject areas. 3. Collaborative planning sessions will be scheduled for horizontal, vertical, and interdisciplinary planning.

Person Responsible	Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus will target learning Gains in the lowest 25th percentile for ELA. Students in the lower quartile in English Language Arts (54%) failed to demonstrate the same rate of growth as compared to the entire school population (65%). Further, students in this component failed to exceed the state average for learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, there will be a 10% increase in learning gains in the lowest quartile of students taking the 2020-2021 FSA ELA assessment as compared to the learning gains for the lowest quartile in the 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implementation of frequent progress monitoring will occur by teacher and administration. Small Group instruction and differentiated instruction based on data will be incorporated into weekly lessons. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students and students will monitor their own progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research-based instructional approaches will be based on the following text: Fisher, Douglas, et al. Rigorous Reading: 5 Access Points for Comprehending Complex Texts. Corwin Literacy, 2018.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Level 1 and 2, MYP students will participate in the Reading Plus remediation program.
2.Level 1 and 2 PYP students will be pulled for small group remediation.
3.Administrators will use weekly lesson plans unloaded onto Share Point/ Schoology to monitor rigorous reading and writing instruction and assignments.
4.Teachers and administrators will meet for collaborative planning and Data Chats to plan for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus will target Learning Gains in the lowest 25th percentile for Math. Students in the lower quartile in Mathematics (67%) failed to demonstrate the same rate of growth as compared to the entire school population (74%). Further, students in this component failed to exceed the state average for learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2020-2021 school year, there will be a 10% increase in learning gains in the lowest quartile of students taking the 2020-2021 FSA Mathematics assessment or Algebra 1/Geometry EOC as compared to the learning gains for the lowest quartile in the 2018-2019 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence based Strategy Students will participate in small group and differentiated instruction. Teacher will conduct frequent data chats with students. Acaletics and I-Ready will be used to supplement instruction and assist with interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	District Academic Focus outlines the programs and instructional strategies that must be used with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

1.Level 1 and 2 MYP students will be scheduled into Intensive Math classes.
2.Level 1 and 2 PYP students will be pulled for small group remediation.
3.Teachers and administrators will meet for collaborative planning and Data Chats to plan for differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible	Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address learning gains for reading, learning gains for math and acceleration by through the Instructional Leadership Teams that include team leaders meetings, faculty meetings, department chair meetings, IB leadership meetings and data chats. Needed instructional support as determined by these meetings will be implemented at both the teacher and student level. Progress monitoring will entail reviewing the data and modifying the approach as appropriate.

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.

Being an International Baccalaureate School, administration stresses the importance of the IB Learner Profile not only with students, but also with all stakeholders who are involved in supporting our school. Some of the more prominent attributes of the profile include being caring, reflective and communicative. Our administration encourages all stakeholders to demonstrate these attributes in their attitudes and actions. This profile is shown as we involve our stakeholders by serving on the School Advisory Committee, volunteering for Community Service Project evaluations, and participating in the Parent Teacher Organization. Outreach programs include Peace Day celebrations, community fundraisers and service volunteering opportunities. .

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00