Manatee County Public Schools

Anna Maria Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Anna Maria Elementary School

4700 GULF DR, Holmes Beach, FL 34217

https://www.manateeschools.net/annamaria

Demographics

Principal: Michael Masiello

Start Date for this Principal: 7/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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.](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

Anna Maria Elementary School

4700 GULF DR, Holmes Beach, FL 34217

https://www.manateeschools.net/annamaria

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 KG-5	No	30%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

Growing together as we plant seeds to learn, dream and succeed; "We strive to support student experiences that will provide them the tools to be successful individuals and members of our community."

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become a community of learners that celebrates our differences and embraces our future.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Barreda, Pidge	Teacher, K-12	*Leads staff meetings and professional learning training *Lead or are involved in the Intensive Support Team (IST) *Data Team meetings *Literacy Leadership Team *Administration completes evaluations and walkthroughs *Serve as instructional leaders in the school and advise the staff *Provides support for students and parents in all aspects of the school environment to promote positive academic achievement and school relationships
Wooten, Gary	Teacher, K-12	
Tabicman, Susan	School Counselor	
Featherston, Jackie	Principal	
Graham, Ivory	Other	
Crawford, Kelly	Teacher, PreK	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/8/2020, Michael Masiello

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

5

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
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)	38%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	19	34	34	41	45	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	213
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 8/26/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	18	39	33	42	48	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	18	39	33	42	48	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	222
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	75%	52%	57%	79%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	57%	58%	66%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	55%	53%	64%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	63%	76%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	68%	62%	51%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	53%	51%	52%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	48%	53%	65%	42%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(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	69%	51%	18%	58%	11%
	2018	83%	49%	34%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	56%	24%	58%	22%
	2018	75%	51%	24%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	74%	52%	22%	56%	18%
	2018	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	88%	60%	28%	62%	26%
	2018	79%	56%	23%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	65%	25%	64%	26%
	2018	88%	61%	27%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	77%	60%	17%	60%	17%
	2018	73%	58%	15%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	59%	48%	11%	53%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	49%	2%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					
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	44			60							
HSP	50			60							
WHT	78	66	67	86	77	63	58				
FRL	65	47	50	80	70		67				
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	29			19							
HSP	73			73							
MUL	67			83							
WHT	73	58	44	80	69	47	52				
FRL	76	68		78	79		56				
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	45	58		40	50						
HSP	70			70							
WHT	80	68	60	76	52	55	67				
FRL	78	62	60	75	53		50				

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	66
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	463

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Multiracial Students	
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	71
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	63
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 learning gains of the lowest 25% on FSA Math in grades 3-5 had 55% for 2019-2019 which is an increase of 9% over the prior years score.

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

There was no decline in any prior year scores in any FSA tested areas.

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.

The data component with the greatest gap was in Math achievement with Anna Maria grade 3-5 students scoring 85% achieving a level 3 or above compared to the state average of 65% in 2019. We did intensive remediation in grades 3-5 with all students identified as having a skill deficit.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math achievement with Anna Maria grade 3-5 students scoring at 85% achieving a level 3 or above compared to the state average of

65% in 2019. We did intensive remediation in grades 3-5 with any students identified as having a skill deficit.

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

The one potential EWS piece of data that we identify as a area of concern is tardiness and attendance.

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

1. Achievement level of L25's in ELA and Math.
2. Learning gains of all students in K-5 in ELA and Math.
3. Increasing proficiency in grade 5 SSA (Science).
4. Improving school-wide attendance.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2019 SSA Science in 5th Grade 60% of our students scored on level 3 or above on their Science achievement scores. Science is taught K-5 with the intent of better supporting student learning in Science in order to increase 5th grade SSA Science scores.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of 2020-2021 school year 63% of students in grade 5 will meet proficiency in Science as measured by the 5th Grade SSA Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jackie Featherston (featherj@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To increase Science vocabulary and hands on instruction through "spaced practice" which will impact the trend for student achievement in elementary school, science standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Professor John Hattie, author of Visible Learning, and researcher of educational practices, developed quantitative values for influences that relate to learning outcomes. He found the average effect size to be 0.40. According to his barometer, "spaced practice" has an effect size of 0.60. By including greater reinforcement of science vocabulary through the use of IXL Science program practice in grades 2-5, in addition to our current science curriculum, and STEM, Science proficiency scores should increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Pull out support and resources for remediation programs during the school day
2. Release time for teacher planning to craft lesson plans for remediation programs.
3. Academic supplemental materials,i.e. IXL, Nearpod.
4. Continued Schoology training for staff to meets the academic needs of online and brick and mortar students through quality planning.

Person Responsible	Jackie Featherston (featherj@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Support and resources for remediation programs during the school day using the STEM teacher, Art teacher,
School Support Specialist, Tech support, and guidance clerk.
2. Continued Schoology training for staff to meets the academic needs of online and brick and mortar students
through quality instructional support K-5.

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.

N/A

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: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00