

Manatee County Public Schools

Ida M. Stewart Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Ida M. Stewart Elementary School

7905 15TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

Demographics

Principal: Joe Hougland

Start Date for this Principal: 9/1/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (55%) 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	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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Ida M. Stewart Elementary School

7905 15TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	24%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

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

The mission of Stewart Elementary School is to stimulate students to become self-motivated, life-long learners by providing appropriate educational experience through the involvement of staff, parents, and community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a safe and stimulating environment where students are trustworthy and take learning seriously to reach their highest academic, social and emotional potential. Students will meet these high expectations while learning how to be respectful and responsible citizens so they can make their best contribution to society.

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
Hougland, Joseph	Principal	
Heathcote, Lisa	Assistant Principal	
Butler, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	
Savchuk, Michelle	School Counselor	
Drao, Heather	Teacher, ESE	
Bosner, Heather	Teacher, K-12	
Schultz, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
Thomas, Vanzetta	Teacher, K-12	
Powell, Kelly	Dean	
Santora, Jennifer		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 9/1/2020, Joe Hougland

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (55%) 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	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	64	70	49	77	53	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	8	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	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	3	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

Thursday 9/3/2020

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	78	51	78	70	64	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	7	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	78	51	78	70	64	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	405
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	7	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	76%	52%	57%	68%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	57%	58%	57%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	55%	53%	31%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	63%	63%	70%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	68%	62%	61%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	39%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	48%	53%	59%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
	2018	79%	49%	30%	57%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	56%	30%	58%	28%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	67%	52%	15%	56%	11%
	2018	76%	52%	24%	55%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	60%	10%	62%	8%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	65%	12%	64%	13%
	2018	80%	61%	19%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	70%	60%	10%	60%	10%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	48%	5%	53%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	63%	49%	14%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
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	55	56	57	53	63	50	31				
ELL	32	50		37	55						
HSP	50	69	64	48	67	44	40				
WHT	84	65	69	85	80	31	57				
FRL	53	60	65	58	63	35	35				
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	48	57	53	52	53	29	33				
HSP	63	68		57	57		46				
WHT	77	64	50	83	74	53	70				
FRL	52	55	40	60	64	39	50				
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	43	31	21	43	36	28	37				
HSP	56	54	23	58	57	40	38				
WHT	69	56	24	73	62	35	66				
FRL	53	53	35	55	52	35	48				

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	61
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	26
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40
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	
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	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	
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	67
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	50
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.

In 2019, just 41% of our L-25 Math students made gains as compared to 2018 of 50%. We did not have our typical curriculum to address the Florida Math Standards. We anticipate that performance will be 50% or higher this year.

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

Our Science achievement went from 64% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. Prior to last year, we had a departmentalized 5th grade. The Science teacher then took a position teaching STEM. Our achievement was impacted as other teachers gained traction with their teaching. Benchmarks during the 2019-2020 school looked very promising. Our benchmark assessment for Quarter 1 was 78%, and Quarter 2 was 83% proficient.

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.

As stated above, just 41% of our L25 math students made gains. This is below BOTH the state and County average. The gap year in curriculum material appears to have impacted student performance. This indicated a need for teacher training in Math standards.

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

Our ELA L25 growth improved from 52% in 2018 to 69% in 2019. This is a testament to our hard work with strategic, small group instruction during WIN time. This is only going to improve with our experience. Unfortunately, because of COVID, our small group instruction is happening with just homeroom classes for now. Teachers are working hard to create a pathway to success.

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

We do not have areas of concern.

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

1. Math L25
2. Science
3. NOTE: ELL Subgroup removed due to redistricting in the school district. We currently have 6 ELL students remaining at Stewart.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus	
Description and Rationale:	We will continue to focus on our L25 Math students because just 41% made gains during testing in 2019. Last year's Q2 benchmark showed 61% made gains. We will focus on effective differentiation and scaffolding of standards.
Measurable Outcome:	If we focus on effective differentiation and scaffolding of standards then at least 60% of our L25 Math students will show gains and growth by May 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the GAP (Goal, Analysis, Plan) eliminator to differentiate and scaffold standards to effectively and efficiently fill the gaps of learning for our L25 Math students. We will utilize IXL, I Ready Standards Mastery, District Benchmarks, Acaletics and Reflex Math to monitor progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The GAP eliminator will assist us in effectively and efficiently scaffolding content for each learner. We will utilize IXL, I Ready Standards Mastery, District Benchmarks, Acaletics and Reflex Math to monitor progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We know our goal is to show 60% or more of our L-25 Math students making gains.
2. We will analyze data and create an action plan.
3. Strategic resources will be selected and aligned to student needs.
4. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats to review data, and determine how assessment of all data (T 1,2 and 3) informs instruction.
5. We will offer remediation to those students who could benefit.

Person Responsible Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we implement a K-5 Science plan to include an emphasis on Power Standards along with interactive science notebooks (writing to raise achievement), then proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 Science will increase from 53% to 70% as measured in the 2020-2021 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	If we implement a K-5 Science plan to include an emphasis on Power Standards along with interactive science notebooks (writing to raise achievement), then proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 Science will increase from 53% to 70% or more as measured in the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize Study Island Science and HMH standards-based assessments and district benchmarks to monitor student progress. We will utilize GAP (Goal, Analysis, Plan) eliminator to effectively differentiate and scaffold standards and fill the gaps of learning for our students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the GAP (Goal, Analysis, Plan) eliminator to effectively differentiate and scaffold standards and fill the gaps of learning for our Science students. We will utilize Study Island Science, HMH assessments and District Benchmarks to monitor student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. We know our goal is to be 70% or more proficient in Science.
2. We will analyze data from initial Science assessments and create an action plan.
3. Strategic resources will be selected and aligned to student needs.
4. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats to review data, and determine how assessment of all Science data (T 1,2 and 3) informs instruction.
5. We will offer remediation to those students who could benefit.

Person Responsible Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We have no other school-wide improvement priorities.

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.

School Updates

- PTO Facebook Page
- Stewart Website
- Stewart Facebook Page
- Teacher individual newsletters/Schoology
- Email and Connect Ed phone calls
- Family Fun Nights such as, Father Daughter Dance, Boo-Hoo breakfast, Fall Festival, etc.)
- Parent/Student fundraisers
- Silent Auction
- SAC
- Back To School Night Open House
- Report Card Conference Nights
- Science Fair and Music Performance Night
- Stewart Star Assemblies quarterly
- PTO keeping membership at a reasonable cost
- Family Fun Nights (aka - skate night, dinner at Sweetberries, etc)

NOTE: Many activities are paused for now due to COVID.

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00