

Manatee County Public Schools

Palmetto Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	26

Palmetto Elementary School

1540 10TH ST W, Palmetto, FL 34221

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

Demographics

Principal: Billie Jo Tyne Fintel

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Palmetto Elementary School

1540 10TH ST W, Palmetto, FL 34221

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">83%</p>

School Grades History

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

Practice safety, achieve goals, work smart, and show respect; every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide a safe, diverse community where all children can grow intellectually, socially, and emotionally through quality education and student engagement while becoming optimistic and unique builders of their 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
Tyne Fintel, Billie-Jo	Principal	<p>The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) ensures that the school community works together to continually improve teaching and learning. The ILT engages the school community in using data to develop teaching and learning goals that align to the vision and mission of the school to promote academic success for every student.</p> <p>The ILT facilitates the development of improvement plans to achieve teaching and learning goals and adapts plans as needed.</p> <p>The ILT plans professional development and provides other resources (e.g. coaching) to support school wide implementation of instructional practices.</p> <p>The ILT develops a climate of trust and respect to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices and organizational structures to improve student learning.</p> <p>The ILT creates, revises, and implements policies and procedures to build staff capacity and to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.</p> <p>The ILT implements and monitors data systems and use evidence and data with staff to monitor teaching and learning goals.</p> <p>The ILT communicates consistently about growth, areas of need, and celebrates successes related to teaching and learning.</p> <p>The action and decisions of the team reflect a shared commitment to achievement of improvement goals and the implementation plan.</p>
Weicht, Aaron	Dean	<p>Dr. Weicht plays part in the development of guidelines for proper student conduct, disciplinary policies, and procedures that ensure a safe and orderly environment. He serves as the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Coordinator and Testing Coordinator. He designs short-and long-range plans related to student discipline and school safety using current research, performance data, and feedback from staff, students, parents and community agencies. Dr. Weicht collects, reviews, and analyzes discipline data. He implements strategies with parents, students, and teachers to facilitate student behavior change. He uses relevant student information, i.e., Individual Education Plan (IEP), as an integral part of recommendations for disciplinary action. Dr. Weicht provides guidance to and instruction for teachers in the implementation of discipline policies, school safety, and with training provided as needed. Dr. Weicht also works with the ILT in planning and implementing a professional development/growth program for teachers and staff.</p>
Surette, Kathleen	School Counselor	<p>Elementary school counselors are educators uniquely trained in child development, learning strategies, self-management and social skills, who understand and promote success for today’s diverse students. Ms. Surette provides education, prevention and intervention activities, which are integrated into all aspects of children’s lives. Ms. Surette is integral to the total educational program. She provides a proactive program that engages students and includes leadership, advocacy and collaboration with school staff, administration and community/ family members in the delivery of programs and activities to help students achieve success. She also</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>collaborates with teachers and parents on early identification and intervention of children’s academic and social/emotional needs, which is essential in removing barriers to learning and developing skills and behaviors critical for academic achievement. Ms. Surette also works with the ILT in planning and implementing a professional development/growth program for teachers and staff.</p>
<p>Porco, Melissa</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>As the Assistant Principal, Ms. Porco plays a key role in the leadership, coordination, supervision and management of the school program and operation. She assists in developing and maintaining an effective educational program consistent with State and Federal guidelines and the philosophy, policies and goals of the School Board; meeting and conferring with students, parents, faculty and staff; maintaining records and files; preparing reports. Ms. Porco assists with the overall administration of the school; interpreting and enforcing school and district policies and regulations. Ms. Porco takes an active role in the collaborative development, implementation, and ongoing refinement of the school’s Plan for Continuous Improvement. She also assists in monitoring compliance with federal, state, and local mandates and guidelines related to local and state testing programs and the local special education program. Ms. Porco also works with the ILT in planning and implementing a professional development/growth program for teachers and staff.</p>
<p>Steininger, Jane</p>	<p>Attendance/ Social Work</p>	<p>Ms. Steininger serves as the Graduation Enhancement Technician (GET) at Palmetto Elementary School. GETs are allocated to schools receiving federal Title One funding. Ms. Steininger develops and utilizes early warning systems to identify students who are most at risk due to absenteeism, lack of health/personal care, homelessness, and poor parent involvement. She collaborates with school social workers, school counselors, teachers, and school leaders to develop systemic strategies to identify and support students who are frequently absent within our most at-risk populations. Ms. Steininger also works with the ILT in planning and implementing a professional development/growth program for teachers and staff.</p>
<p>Dowd, Jenna</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Ms. Dowd works with students, teachers, and school administrators, fulfilling several roles. Literacy and reading coaches perform the following duties: She works with educators to identify issues with students or curriculum, set goals, and solve problems. Ms. Dowd collaborates with educators and school administrators to develop curriculum and lesson plans. She leads and/or participates in study groups alongside educators. She supports teachers with conducting student assessments and analyzing student work. Ms. Dowd Designs and leads professional development presentations for educators. She models lessons to help educators learn. Ms. Dowd also works with the ILT in planning and implementing a professional development/growth program for teachers and staff.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ebbesmeyer, Susie	Other	<p>Ms. Johnson supports the principal and assistant principal in monitoring the work environment to ensure it is safe and in alignment with the District mission and Strategic Plan. She provides leadership and vision to create an atmosphere conducive to student learning at the highest possible levels and assumes responsibility for the school's operation. Ms. Johnson assists in developing, implementing, and evaluating instructional programs and activities at PES. She assists the principal and assistant principal in providing atmosphere conducive to learning and teaching. Ms. Johnson also coordinates the selection and acquisition of instructional materials and equipment. She is responsible for the supervision and evaluation of school-based personnel. Ms. Johnson also works with the ILT in planning and implementing a professional development/growth program for teachers and staff.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Billie Jo Tyne Fintel

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.*

4

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Demographic Data

<p>2020-21 Status (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Active</p>
<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p>	<p>Elementary School PK-5</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p>	<p>K-12 General Education</p>
<p>2019-20 Title I School</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p>	<p>100%</p>
<p>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners*</p>

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: D (39%)
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	86	96	100	128	94	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	620
Attendance below 90 percent	18	32	17	33	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	11	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	11	27	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	1	1	1	1	20	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	1	31	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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	69	100	90	128	109	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
-----------------------------	----	-----	----	-----	-----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	3	12	17	11	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
-----------------------------	---	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

One or more suspensions	5	5	2	11	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
-------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	21	37	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Students with two or more indicators	2	6	3	4	6	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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	69	100	90	128	109	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	3	12	17	11	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	5	5	2	11	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	21	37	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	3	4	6	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	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times		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	38%	52%	57%	36%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	57%	58%	59%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	55%	53%	64%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	63%	63%	50%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	68%	62%	69%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	53%	51%	53%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	38%	48%	53%	38%	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	36%	51%	-15%	58%	-22%
	2018	18%	49%	-31%	57%	-39%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	31%	56%	-25%	58%	-27%
	2018	25%	51%	-26%	56%	-31%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	40%	52%	-12%	56%	-16%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	60%	-18%	62%	-20%
	2018	21%	56%	-35%	62%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	65%	-22%	64%	-21%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
05	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	38%	48%	-10%	53%	-15%
	2018	43%	49%	-6%	55%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	12	35	37	18	62	59	10				
ELL	29	48	55	43	75	66	25				
BLK	37	50		55	78	73	41				
HSP	31	48	55	45	76	67	35				
MUL	55			55							
WHT	56	71	55	64	60	20	44				
FRL	35	52	48	47	71	56	31				
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	7	39	44	13	33	28	7				
ELL	11	39	46	27	49	50	11				
BLK	27	41		42	56		42				
HSP	26	45	44	41	59	51	41				
WHT	48	61		55	63		40				
FRL	28	45	43	41	58	46	41				
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	5	45	64	11	32	27	8				
ELL	18	53	64	34	62	56	9				
BLK	35	48		52	72		42				
HSP	34	59	64	49	70	54	34				
WHT	42	63	75	49	61		57				
FRL	32	58	60	45	66	51	34				

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	53
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	420
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	50
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	56
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	52
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	55
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	53
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.

The ELA Achievement component showed the lowest performance. ELA Achievement was 38%. Although the ELA Achievement component showed the lowest performance, the ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25th Percentile components showed improvement. ELA Learning Gains increased 6%. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile increased 6%. The Science Achievement was also 38%.

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

The fifth grade ELA Achievement component showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Fifth grade ELA Achievement decreased 8% from the previous year.

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 ELA Achievement component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. When compared to the state average, third grade ELA Achievement showed a 22% gap; fourth grade ELA Achievement showed a 27% gap; and fifth grade showed a 16% gap.

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

Math showed the most improvement. Math Achievement increased 7%. Math Learning Gains increased 12%. Math Lowest 25th Percentile increased 15%.

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

1. The number of students who scored a level 1 of the 2019 FSA ELA.
2. The number of students with attendance below 90% (the majority of students with attendance to date below 90% are students enrolled in the eLearning modality).

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

In the upcoming school year, the highest priorities for school-wide improvement will be ensuring:

1. General education and special education teachers use Florida Standards as the foundation for instruction for students with and without disabilities.
2. All instructional and related services personnel use formative assessment processes and tools to gather, analyze, and evaluate data about effective instruction and behavior interventions for all students with and without disabilities.
3. A multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) and problem-solving process is consistently used by school personnel to ensure progress in the general education curriculum, across all grades and settings, for all students with and without disabilities.
4. Short-term and long-term goals related to implementing and improving inclusive practices are developed and monitored regularly.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

An Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will be established. The ILT will include the principal, assistant principal, school coordinator, dean, instructional coach(es), school counselor, and teacher leader(s). The ILT will focus on improvement of teaching and learning schoolwide. An improvement in teaching and learning practices will result in increased student learning and achievement.
 School data, grade level data, and subgroup data indicate the majority of students are not meeting grade level expectations. This requires a cohesive plan for addressing Tier 1 instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2021, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA as measured by state assessments.
 By June 2021, 60% of students will score satisfactory in Math as measured by state assessments.
 By June 2021, 43% of students will score satisfactory in Science as measured by state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The ILT...
 * engages the school community in using data to develop teaching and learning goals that align to the vision and mission of the school to promote academic success for every student.
 * facilitates the development of improvement plans to achieve teaching and learning goals and adapts plans as needed.
 * plans professional development and provides other resources (e.g. coaching) to support school wide implementation of instructional practices.
 * develops a climate of trust and respect to engage colleagues in conversations about student learning data and ways to use data to improve instructional practices and organizational structures to improve student learning.
 * creates, revises, and implements policies and procedures to build staff capacity and to support the continuous improvement of teaching and learning.
 * communicates consistently about growth, areas of need, and celebrates successes related to teaching and learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teacher leadership is widely understood to improve student achievement and classroom practices by promoting peer-led professional development. Teacher leadership also creates positive teaching climates and increase educator retention. When we learn together as a community toward a shared purpose, we will create an environment in which we feel congruence and worth. Collective Teacher Efficacy is one of the greatest influences on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Build a Cohesive Instructional Leadership Team (develop formal leaders as thoughtful, focused, and collaborative instructional leaders). The first step with focus on assuring all leaders behave in a functional, cohesive way. When a school's leaders are cohesive, they are aligned around a common set of answers to a few critical questions, they communicate those answers again and again, and they put effective processes in place too reinforce those answers, which creates an environment in which students achieve at high levels.

Person Responsible

Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Create Clarity (achieving alignment around the top, collective priority).

Members of the ILT must be clear on the answers to critical questions and eliminate discrepancies in thinking. The ILT will determine the school's strategy for achieving success around the top, collective priorities (with a focus on what is most important, right now).

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Communicate Clarity (communicate core values, key messages, and goals)

Effective communication is an essential component of the change process. Mission, vision, values, and goals will become irrelevant, and the change process will stall unless the significance of these building blocks are communicated on a daily basis throughout the school.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Reinforce Clarity (process and structures that align with core values and collective priorities)

The ILT will develop a long-range plan that allocates resources to the school's most important priorities in ways that will improve student performance. The strategic plan will leverage all of the school's resources - people, time, and money - to improve student learning. The ILT will examine the compatibility of various components of the plan to ensure they align with the school's core values and goals. The ILT will set measurable indicators of progress and measure them. The strategic plan will be adjusted in response to student needs and changing teacher capacities.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) provide an opportunity for teachers to come together to consult with colleagues and deepens skills with the goal of improving student achievement. The “big ideas” that represent the core principles of PLC are:

Big Idea #1: Ensuring That Students Learn

Big Idea #2: A Culture of Collaboration

* Collaborating for School Improvement

* Removing Barriers to Success

Big Idea #3: A Focus on Result.

School data, grade level data, and subgroup data indicate the majority of students are not meeting grade level expectations. The implementation of systematic and school-wide structures and processes are necessary to improve student performance. Each team will select learning goals for their team's PLC that compliments the school's comprehensive instructional improvement goals for the year.

Measurable Outcome:

By June 2021, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA as measured by state assessments.

By June 2021, 60% of students will score satisfactory in Math as measured by state assessments.

By June 2021, 43% of students will score satisfactory in Science as measured by state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will engage in a PLC designed to strengthen professional practice and improve student learning. The PLC model is built on the foundational belief that the core mission of formal education is to ensure that students learn (not simply that they are taught). Richard DuFour's research demonstrates how this shift from a focus on teaching to a focus on learning has profound implications for schools.

Team members will review student performance data (school wide, grade level, and subgroups), their own performance, areas of current problems, instructional strategies, and techniques needing improvement. Then, together, they will identify instructional improvement goals. Teams will then follow a common growth model: Investigate best practices to increase student achievement; study, learn, and train together (relying on one another's expertise, instructional coaches, trained consultants, and video examples); begin using new practices in the classroom; and come together frequently to discuss and dissect piloted practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Working together to improve student achievement through a PLC will be the routine work of everyone in the school. Each team will participate in an ongoing process of identifying the current level of student achievement, establishing a goal to improve the current level, working together to achieve that goal, and providing periodic evidence of progress.

The PLC model requires school staff to focus on learning rather than teaching, work collaboratively on matters related to learning, and hold itself accountable for the kind of results that fuel continual improvement. Professional learning is more effective when it is grounded in issues related to student learning that have been identified by participants and when application of new learning is supported onsite. Effective professional learning also

increases teachers' influence and their power to make decisions on important issues related to school improvement and professional learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Organize for Collaborative Work.

Establish collaborative teams and structures that will enable educators to work together productively. This step involves adopting an improvement process, building a strong system of teams that communicate efficiently, and protecting time throughout the year for these teams to work. It also includes clarifying expectations for effective meetings, agreeing to norms for collaborative work, and acknowledging work style preferences. Finally, it entails creating a data inventory and an inventory of all the instructional initiatives already underway at a school.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 2: Build Assessment Literacy.

Increase staff members' comfort with the kinds of data they will be using throughout the inquiry process. Key tasks here involve reviewing the skills that will be tested on the assessments students will take and considering how these skills compare with the broader domain of skills and knowledge students need to master. Teachers will also learn the principles of responsible data use and practice studying assessment results.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 3: Data Overview.

A priority question will be developed that members are committed to exploring. The ILT will conduct a thorough analysis of recent data pertaining to a focus area and find patterns they believe are important for the entire faculty to think about. The data will be organized into charts and presented to the staff. School leaders will engage teachers in making sense of the charts and identifying a specific question they want to dig into.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 4: Dig into Student Data.

Once a priority question is chosen, subsequent meetings will be held to identify a learner-centered problem that directly relates to the priority question. This involves examining and analyzing a wide range of data in the target area, including student work samples, performance on benchmark assessments, observations of students, or conversations with them about their learning. From these sources of evidence, teachers come to a shared understanding of what the data show about students' learning and identify a common learning challenge.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 5: Examine Instruction.

Teams will examine instruction in order to determine a problem of practice that may be contributing to the learner-centered problem. Key tasks at this point will include examining a wide range of instructional data and observing teachers in classrooms.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 6: Develop an Action Plan.

Teams will create a complete, concise action plan for addressing the problem of practice. They'll decide on an instructional strategy, agree on what that strategy will look like in classrooms, and put the plan in

writing. Teams will work with ILT members to determine what kinds of professional development they'll need in order to address the learner-center problem they've identified.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 7: Plan to Assess Progress.

Meetings at this stage will focus on the identification of data sources teachers will use to evaluate how the changes they implement will affect student learning. Teams will establish SMART goals that are student centered for the various data sources they intend to analyze.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Step 8: Acting and Assessing.

Teams will carry out the action plan and teachers will assess the extent to which they did what they committed to do, and whether student learning goals are met. Teams will analyze data sources to determine whether they need to make adjustments to the action plan or the instructional strategies.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities was an under-performing subgroup on previous state assessments. School improvement efforts will focus on providing access and quality inclusive education at all levels for children with special needs in education. A high quality of inclusive education leads to enhanced learning and the participation of all students with special educational needs in all aspects and areas of society at large.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2021, 50% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA as measured by state assessments.

By June 2021, 60% of students will score satisfactory in Math as measured by state assessments.

By June 2021, 43% of students will score satisfactory in Science as measured by state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Support and improve the quality of inclusive education by strengthening school policies, culture, and practices.

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative structures will be implemented to ensure that teachers and specialists have the time and space to work together to support students.

Recurring general and special education teacher and service provider meetings will be scheduled.

Students with disabilities will be educated in content-rich, general education settings to the greatest extent possible.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Currently, students with disabilities are performing below the Federal Index. In order to improve the achievement of students with disabilities, children with special educational needs need to be included in the developmental/educational activities alongside their peers with mechanisms to improve access and equity.

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure that all teachers and staff are trained and receive the necessary support to perform in inclusive learning environments, through collaboration, interaction, and problem solving.

The ILT will work with the district inclusion specialist and ESE specialist to establish a framework for professional learning and provide ongoing, job-embedded support.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Implement collaborative structures and provide time for teachers to plan and teach collaboratively. Make decisions about service delivery based on the individualized needs of students with disabilities.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Ensuring the constant monitoring and evaluation of inclusive education to ensure that segregation is not happening either formally or informally.

Person Responsible Billie-Jo Tyne Fintel (tynebj@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Each grade level team will continue to work together to provide students with high quality instruction and intervention that will be matched to student need(s). We will use school-wide, grade-level data, and sub-group data to identify trends and patterns. Data collected at each tier will be used to measure the efficacy of the supports so that meaningful decisions can be made about which instruction and interventions should be maintained and layered. Students who need instructional intervention beyond what was provided universally for academic content areas will be provided with targeted, supplemental interventions individually or in small groups at increasing levels of intensity. Throughout the continuum of instruction and intervention, planning/problem-solving will be used to match instructional resources to educational need. Teams will engage in collaborative instructional planning and problem-solving to ensure that student success is achieved and maintained across all sub-groups within the school.

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.

At Palmetto Elementary School, we believe children achieve greater academic and social success when schools, families, and community groups work together.

Family engagement activities will align with school improvement goals and connect families with the teaching and learning goals for students. Building respectful and trusting relationships between home and school will also be a focus of the 2020 – 2021 Palmetto Elementary School Parent and Family Engagement Policy.

Parent and teacher conferences, capacity building workshops, seminars, and volunteer opportunities will be designed to support all stakeholders in partnering with one another and in developing the capacity to share the responsibility for improving student achievement and school performance.

All parents of children receiving Title I services have the right to be involved in making decisions regarding how the funds are allotted as well as professional development of programs and family engagement activities. The Parent and Family Engagement Policy is developed with input from parents, community members, and staff. Parents, community members, and staff provide input into the comprehensive plan through the Title I Spring Survey, participation in School Advisory Committee (SAC) meetings, and school-based staff meetings. The Parent and Family Engagement Policy is monitored and revised by SAC and staff as necessary based on student needs.

The Parent and Family Engagement Policy is readily available to parents, staff, and the public. A copy of the Parent and Family Engagement Policy is posted on the school website and available in the school office in a language parents understand.

All parents are informed of opportunities to be involved and their right to be involved in the budgeting and

use of parent and family engagement funding via the school website, the school Facebook page, newsletters, and via Blackboard Connect messaging systems. Time is dedicated during SAC meetings to explain the parent and family engagement budget, the reasoning for why things are done, and parents are given opportunities to engage in dialogue around the parent and family engagement budget. Parents are also given opportunities to provide input on the parent and family engagement budget via surveys and through email.

Our school works with other federal programs, district departments, the local business community, library systems, governmental, and non-governmental organizations to provide integrated parent and family engagement opportunities, such as but not limited to: IDEA, VPK, 21st Century, Project Heart, ESOL/ Migrant, local churches, Head Start, Title I, Public Library and Palmetto Police Department.

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: Leadership: Instructional Leadership Team	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00