Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

601 43RD ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/miller

Demographics

Principal: Debra Riley

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	72%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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

Jessie P. Miller Elementary School

601 43RD ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/miller

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	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

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

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 Jessie P. Miller Elementary is to build a strong foundation for the love of learning that encourages students to achieve at their highest potential occurring within a community of collaboration and support.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jessie P. Miller takes pride in its long-standing tradition of providing a positive, nurturing learning environment for generations of local families.

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
Riley, Debra	Principal	
Harrison, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
Westendorf, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	
Deleo, Kimberly	Assistant Principal	
Potter, Katelyn	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Debra Riley

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.*
7

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)	72%
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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: C (51%)
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	85	90	102	105	85	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	8	5	6	16	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	5	5	5	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	5	5	10	13	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in Math	2	2	12	14	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	17	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	1	2	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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 9/2/2020

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	110	103	102	123	112	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	10	20	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	5	6	3	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	8	3	35	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	32	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	4	3	0	10	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	

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	110	103	102	123	112	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	664
Attendance below 90 percent	10	10	10	20	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	5	6	3	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Course failure in ELA or Math	10	8	3	35	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	33	32	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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	4	3	0	10	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	

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	56%	52%	57%	49%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	57%	58%	52%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	53%	47%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	63%	63%	52%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	68%	62%	42%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	53%	51%	29%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	48%	53%	47%	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	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
	2018	58%	49%	9%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	56%	-2%	58%	-4%
	2018	56%	51%	5%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison	-2%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
05	2019	50%	52%	-2%	56%	-6%
	2018	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison	-6%					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison	-11%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	65%	4%	64%	5%
	2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison	-4%					
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	47%	58%	-11%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison	17%					
Cohort Comparison	0%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	50%	48%	2%	53%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	49%	9%	55%	3%
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	32	46	46	34	58	50	11				
ELL	32	33	18	37	60	58	29				
BLK	24	45	55	41	50	45	20				
HSP	43	48	35	55	65	47	44				
MUL	59	63		50	58		50				
WHT	66	52	50	78	71	48	63				
FRL	49	53	48	61	64	52	45				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	30	48	36	41	55	46	33				
ELL	38	55	47	51	58	46	36				
BLK	31	48		39	43		31				
HSP	45	53	42	58	58	43	48				
MUL	58	59		63	71						
WHT	64	61	48	68	56	48	67				
FRL	47	49	49	56	55	51	48				
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	20	30	27	27	36	26	20				
ELL	21	38	29	38	33	36					
BLK	35	56	50	38	44	20	38				
HSP	36	53	38	40	39	35	27				
MUL	45			55							
WHT	59	51	55	61	44	29	60				
FRL	42	50	46	44	34	27	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)	TS&I

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	456
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
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	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	55
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 lowest overall data component for the 18-19 school year is the learning gains of the lowest 25% of students in both ELA and Math across the tested grade levels. Both ELA and Math scores in this component average 48% and remain stagnant from the prior school year. The major factor contributing to the lack of growth of the L25 students is that our teachers need more support to hone their data analysis skills to better determine the specific areas of deficit for these students so that they can provide the specific interventions needed to see growth.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year is Science Achievement. The score for the 18-19 school year is 50% which is an 8% decrease from the previous year's. Even though the school scored higher than the district average of 48%, there was still a factor that

contributed to the score decline. Our 5th grade science teacher left on maternity leave in mid-March 2019, so she rushed to cover all of the science content prior to her leave. Although our students were provided instruction for all tested standards, they did not have enough time with the Life Science domain to master the content prior to the state science assessment.

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.

Our 5th grade ELA score showed the greatest gap compared to the state average. Our 5th grade students scored 6% lower than the state average of 56%. We plan to closely examine the instructional materials that our teachers are using, in addition to the adopted materials, to determine if they match the rigor needed to obtain growth.

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

Our 5th grade math scores showed the highest levels of improvement with an increase of 17%. The score went from 47% to 64%. The 5th grade math teachers paid very close attention to the math standards and test item specifications for each standard. They have diligently practiced data analysis of all the district benchmark assessment data to notice trends and areas of need. They had a daily math block of 90 minutes. We also implemented a small group intructional design targeted at front loading new learning that would take place in the classroom. Students attended these sessions three times per week and were introduced to new concepts prior to the teacher introducing them to the whole class. By increasing students' background knowledge earlier, the students were comfortable with new math material and achieved a higher level of success.

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

Based on a comparison of the prior year and the current year EWS data, all numbers have improved from the prior year.

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

1. Increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile in ELA to eliminate the deficit in this subgroup.
2. Increase the learning gains of the lowest quartile in Math to eliminate the deficit in this subgroup.
3. Increase the level of achievement for our black students as identified on the ESSA data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The rationale for needing to increase the learning gains of our L25 students in ELA is due to the lack of growth we have seen in this subgroup over the past two years. Our scores in this area have been at 48% for the 17-18 and 18-19 school year. While our teachers are proficient in identifying students who fall into this subgroup, they don't always match interventions needed to specific need.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 20-21 school year, our L25 students will increase their ELA learning gains from 48% to 55% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Data analysis of quarterly BAS/Next Steps reading assessments and Words Their Way Spelling Inventories to group students based on specific earning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school utilizes LLI as the primary intervention for students identified as Tier 2 through MTSS. While this program is highly effective, our students are not exiting the program as timely as they should. Data analysis of benchmark assessments and iReady suggest that our L25 students lack the phonemic awareness skills necessary to grow as readers. Our intention is to have teachers use data gleaned from the BAS/Next Steps Assessments and spelling inventories, in addition to other data sources, to group students for intervention based on need and not reading level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students are BAS/Nest Steps assessed at the beginning of each quarter. Teachers complete and submit a Progress Monitoring Data Sheet used to track student data.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

2. PD provided to teachers to properly assess BAS/Next Steps and spelling inventory results. Grade levels are provided time to plan for small group instruction based on student need.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

3. Instructional Leadership Team meetings scheduled monthly to analyze data as scheduled on the school wide assessment calendar and assessment matrix.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

4. Monitoring of weekly lesson plans in Schoology to ensure that teachers are upholding district lesson planning requirements.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The rationale for this area of focus is due to the lack of increase in math scores from this subgroup for the past two years. The scores have remained constant at 48% for the 17-18 and 18-19 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 20-21 school year, the L25 students will increase their math learning gains from 48% to 55% as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of enVision Florida Mathematics with fidelity Continued use of Math in Practice Implement Acaletics in Grades 4-5
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to the 19-20 school year, there was a gap year for a math adoption. Some of the teachers were using MAFS as their primary math resource and others were using the prior adopted math series. The lack of consistency may have contributed to a lack of growth within this subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

1. . Instructional Leadership Team meetings scheduled monthly to analyze data as scheduled on the school wide assessment calendar and assessment matrix.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

2. Teachers complete and submit a Progress Monitoring Data Sheet used to track student data.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

3. Quarterly collaborative planning sessions.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

4. Monitoring of weekly lesson plans in Schoology to ensure that teachers are upholding district lesson planning requirements.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The ESSA Federal Index has identified our Black/African American subgroup as falling below the Federal Index of 41%. Currently, our Black/African American subgroup is just below the target by 1%.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 20-21 school year, our Black/African American subgroup of students will increase their achievement as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment so that the ESSA Federal Index score for this subgroup rises to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA- analysis of BAS/Next Steps, Words Their Way, iReady and quarterly benchmark assessment data Math- provide instruction using enVision, Math in Practice and Acaletics with fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	ELA- Our Black/African American students will be monitored closely, just as we do with our L25 students in ELA to ensure that their areas of deficit in ELA are addressed through specific, targeted small group instruction. Math- Small group instruction should also be provided to this subgroup, as the needs present themselves, so that these students can achieve at higher levels of proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students are BAS/Nest Steps assessed at the beginning of each quarter. Teachers complete and submit a Progress Monitoring Data Sheet used to track student data.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Deleo (deleok@manateeschools.net)

2. Small group instruction provided in area of need based on assessment data.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Harrison (harrisonj@manateeschools.net)

3. . Instructional Leadership Team meetings scheduled monthly to analyze data as scheduled on the school wide assessment calendar and assessment matrix.

Person Responsible	Debra Riley (rileyd@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

-SAC and PTO are made up of teachers, administrators, staff members and parents meet monthly to coordinate events/opportunities offering opportunities to become involved in the school environment.
- The Blackboard Connect program is used to send phone messages and emails to parents to keep them updated regarding important school information and events.
- The school marquee is also used to inform parents about important dates/events.
- Monthly newsletters have been published to communicate various events, plans and activities that are happening around campus to keep families informed.
- The school website and Facebook page is updated frequently with school event information.
- Teachers also communicate with parents through agendas, social media apps, emails and text messages.

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: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00