

Manatee County Public Schools

# Palma Sola Elementary School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Palma Sola Elementary School

6806 5TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Jennie Grimes**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2015

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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](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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

## Palma Sola Elementary School

6806 5TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

### 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	46%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	31%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The Mission of Palma Sola Elementary School community is to embrace an enthusiasm for learning in a challenging, secure, trusting environment as we inspire each other to learn, dream, and achieve.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is aligned with the Manatee County School District in that we will be an exemplary student-focused school that develops lifelong learners to be globally competitive.

### 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
Grimes, Jennifer	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* (1) Develop, implement and assess the academic program leading to student success.</li> <li>* (2) Develop and implement an annual School Improvement Plan.</li> <li>* (3) Coordinate program planning with District staff.</li> <li>* (4) Interview and select qualified employees to be recommended for employment.</li> <li>* (5) Monitor and conduct personnel evaluations and take appropriate action.</li> <li>* (6) Develop an annual assessment for inservice needs leading to faculty improvement.</li> <li>* (7) Provide leadership and vision to the School Improvement Process and changes leading to improvement.</li> <li>* (8) Develop a positive teaching / learning environment leading to teacher and student success.</li> <li>* (9) Develop and implement a safe and orderly school plan.</li> <li>* (10) Develop and implement a successful discipline plan promoting a safe teaching / learning environment.</li> <li>* (11) Promote a positive school image through appropriate communication and community involvement.</li> <li>* (12) Develop high expectations for teachers and students and promote this vision to the community.</li> <li>* (13) Develop and maintain the school budget by involving appropriate input and by meeting local and state guidelines.</li> </ul>
Cherry, Heather	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* (1) Assist in the development, implementation and evaluation of the instructional program, including the use of technology.</li> <li>* (2) Supervise curricular and extracurricular activities as assigned.</li> <li>* (3) Provide recommendations to the Principal regarding curriculum improvement.</li> <li>* (4) Supervise textbook and equipment selection, acquisition and inventory.</li> <li>* (5) Assist the Principal in the administration of the summer school program.</li> <li>* (6) Assist with coordinating student field trips.</li> <li>* (7) Assist in developing the master schedule and assignment of students and staff.</li> </ul>



Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* (8) Assist in the administration of the testing program.</li> <li>* (9) Assist in gathering, analyzing and interpreting data related to student performance.</li> <li>*(10) Assist in coordinating the School Accreditation Program and School Improvement Program.</li> <li>*(11) Assist with the supervision of personnel, including orientation of new employees as assigned.</li> <li>*(12) Assist the Principal in developing personnel assignments and duty rosters.</li> <li>*(13) Assist in implementing and administering negotiated employee contracts.</li> <li>*(14) Assist in the coordination of the school's inservice program.</li> <li>*(15) Assist teachers in developing professional development plans and activities.</li> <li>*(16) Assist in monitoring and assisting substitute teachers.</li> </ul>
Murphy, Marzena	School Counselor	
Pannell-Miller, Michele	Other	
Jadid, Natalie	Instructional Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2015, Jennie Grimes

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

24

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
--	--------

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	56	79	66	88	78	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	455
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	2	0	0	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	95	84	94	99	108	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	13	5	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	10	10	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

**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	13	11	14	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

**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	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	95	84	94	99	108	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	13	5	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	10	10	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47

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	13	11	14	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	5	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

## 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	58%	52%	57%	69%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	65%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	55%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	63%	63%	77%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	68%	62%	73%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	55%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	52%	48%	53%	63%	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	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
	2018	61%	49%	12%	57%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	56%	3%	58%	1%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	56%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	49%	52%	-3%	56%	-7%
	2018	68%	52%	16%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	69%	60%	9%	62%	7%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	72%	65%	7%	64%	8%
	2018	65%	61%	4%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	60%	-1%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	48%	1%	53%	-4%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	49%	21%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
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	24	33	41	33	52	39	11				
ELL	35	48	44	50	53	50	31				
ASN	80			90							
BLK	50			50							
HSP	38	47	50	56	56	44	38				
MUL	53	36		68	64						
WHT	67	57	44	74	58	37	56				
FRL	44	42	47	57	53	37	43				
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	18	32	33	21	9	6					
ELL	18	22	25	44	26	20					
ASN	90			80							
BLK	31			44							
HSP	39	42	26	59	45	29	44				
MUL	81			88							
WHT	69	56	44	75	44	19	76				
FRL	48	48	37	58	35	24	53				
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	33	41	31	34	53	43					
ELL	18	33	35	45	43	27					
BLK	67	40		55	60						
HSP	37	41	29	59	56	25	25				
WHT	77	73	68	82	78	71	75				
FRL	56	58	56	67	67	50	52				

### 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	56
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	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	48
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	85
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
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	50

Hispanic Students	
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	56
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	49
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.**

Palma Sola's lowest performance area was our Math Lowest 25%. However, that was also the area we made the greatest increase in percentage from 24% to 41%. We were very low in this area and addressed it with last year's School Improvement Plan. We held data meetings to discuss strategies and goals for these specific students and our leadership team worked to support our teachers and their individual needs/plans for them.

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

Palma Sola's percent of students proficient in Science had the greatest decline last year. We did not have a SIP Science goal last year and therefore it did not receive the focus it should have. We are



correcting this by making Science one of our three main goals and all grade levels will focus their instruction on science standards using the District Pacing Guides.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The data component that had the greatest gap with the state average was our Math Lowest 25%. This is an area we have been consistently low in and even though we made great gains in this component it is still the area we have the largest gap. We will continue to have Math as one of our three SIP goals and we put several strategies into effect last year that we will continue this year.

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

Our Lowest 25% in Math showed the most improvement last year from 24% to 41%. We made this component one of our three main SIP goals last year and held data meetings with teachers and leadership to discuss their specific needs based on the standards. Our leadership team worked with teachers to support their needs. A school-wide Math Fluency expectation was implemented.

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

Our attendance percentage improved to 95% in 18-19 from 94% in 17-18. The average daily attendance for the 19-20 school year dropped again to 93%. We will continue to work with students, staff, and parents to improve our percentage of students that are in school, on time, everyday.

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

1. Math Lowest 25% and Learning Gains
2. Lowest 25% and Learning Gains
3. Science Proficiency
4. ELA Proficiency
5. Math Proficiency

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

We are below the district and state percentages in overall learning gains and lowest 25%. We are including proficiency even though we are above the district and state percentages because we do not want proficiency to decline as we focus on learning gains. Our math bottom quartile learning gains was our largest drop from the prior school year and now our lowest performing area. By focusing on learning gains in general, our bottom quartile will be positively affected along with learning gains across the board. If we provide additional support and focus in the area of interventions and additional teaching resources, teachers will be able to meet students where they are, teaching remedial or enrichment skills, so that all students can make the needed gains.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By May of 2021, student proficiency in Math will increase to at least 75% from 68% in 2019, overall learning gains in Math to at least 65% from 59%, and students in the Math Lowest 25% will increase to at least 56% from 41%, as measured by the FSA.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Grimes (grimesj@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Teachers will focus instruction on the Standards using the District Pacing Guides, implement the Acaletics with fidelity in both 4th and 5th grades, and use common grade level assessments to be analyzed in weekly Data/Planning Chats. Data collection and ongoing monitoring multiple times per year to ensure the students in the bottom quartile needs are being met; facilitating MTSS meetings to ensure proper math interventions are being implemented and observations to ensure the interventions are being provided with fidelity; work with district instructional specialists to provide additional math PD in the areas of interventions, remediation, and enrichment; reworking our math blocks to provide small group instruction at students' levels to ensure growth, provided an additional 30-minute intervention/enrichment period to provide small group interventions, reteaching and/or enrichment.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

When working with students at their level to fill the missing concepts in number sense, students will develop the necessary skills needed when solving more advanced concepts that build from number sense. The evidence and data used will come from iReady, classroom assessments, math benchmark assessments, classroom and intervention observations and Tiered documentation and discussions during MTSS meetings. Teachers will collect data on their students throughout the year to ensure students are meeting their yearly growth on iReady, intervention progress, standards mastery and grade level benchmark assessments.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Identify bottom quartile students in all grade levels, in addition to the students who may need enrichment opportunities to maintain their FSA scores
2. Ensure teachers know how many points each student needs to make a learning gain
3. Analyze beginning of the year data to ensure students are receiving additional support in the areas of interventions and/or enrichment
4. Provide PD in the area of math interventions and implementation of the performance tasks aligned for each grade level standard
5. Progress monitor iReady data, standards mastery, benchmark assessments and intervention data of students who are in each profile.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Grimes (grimesj@manateeschools.net)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	We are below the district and state percentages in overall learning gains and lowest 25%, and our students with disabilities are not making desired progress. We are including proficiency even though we are above the district and state percentages because we do not want proficiency to decline as we focus on learning gains. By focusing on learning gains, our bottom quartile will be positively affected along with learning gains in general. If we provide additional support and focus in the area of interventions and additional teaching resources, teachers will be able to meet students where they are, teaching remedial or enrichment skills, so that all students can make the needed gains.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May of 2021, student proficiency in ELA will increase to at least 70% from 58%, overall learning gains in ELA to at least 65% from 53%, and students in the ELA Lowest 25 % will increase to at least 51% from 47%, as measured by the FSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jennifer Grimes (grimesj@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Teachers will focus instruction on the Standards using the District Pacing Guides, implement the District approved Writing Program, use iReady with fidelity, and use common grade level assessments to be analyzed in weekly Data/Planning Chats. We will continue our work in differentiated instruction, guided reading using Literacy Footprints in grades K-2, Benchmark Assessment Systems to find instructional reading levels, and using research-based interventions.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We believe that small group differentiated instruction can target not only our lowest quartile students, but also our students who are above scoring proficiency. Our ESE inclusion model provides support for our students in the general education classroom with support from ESE resource teachers. Focusing instruction and assessing students on the Standards while using those assessments to guide future instruction has been proven effective by Marzano and many others. When working with the students at their instructional level, students will develop the necessary skills needed to become independent reading.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards will be the focus of instruction using the District Pacing Guides
2. Standards-based common grade level assessments will be given and entered in School City as determined through data chats
3. Weekly Data Chats will be conducted with Grade Levels and Leadership Teams will review data and create instructional plans
4. Teachers will provide 30 minutes of targeted instruction for remediation students through SWAG
5. Each week, teachers will provide 45 minutes of iReady Lab time with conferencing and students will be expected to have 45 minutes with a passing rate of 75%
7. Kindergarten, first and second grades will implement the Next Step Forward program with fidelity
8. Grade Levels will be provided with 2 whole day planning sessions for team planning. These days will focus on standards, assessment design and/ or professional development as determined in weekly data chats

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Grimes (grimesj@manateeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our percent of students proficient in Science had the greatest decline over the past year. We are correcting this by making Science one of our three main goals and with that all grade levels will focus their instruction on science standards using the District Pacing Guides.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	By May of 2021, student proficiency in Science will increase to at least 70% from 52%, as measured by the SSA.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jennifer Grimes (grimesj@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will ensure all teachers in grades K-2 align their science instruction on district provided science curriculum expectations. This should students ensure entering the intermediate grades have the foundation needed to be successful on the Florida Science Statewide Assessment. Collaborative planning and professional development will focus on standards, test item specifications and utilizing assessment data to identify areas of strength and weaknesses.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Research shows the importance of teacher clarity. With the detailed monthly calendars and benchmark reviews provided by the district curriculum department, teachers are able to plan with the end goals in mind and set clear learning intentions.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Standards will be the focus of instruction using the District Pacing Guides in ALL grade levels.
2. Standards based common grade level assessments will be given and entered in School City as determined through data chats
3. Regular Data Chats will be conducted with Grade Levels and Leadership Team to review data and create instructional plans
4. Grade Levels will be provided with 2 whole day planning sessions for team planning. These days will focus on standards, assessment design and/or professional development as determined by the teams.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Grimes (grimesj@manateeschools.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**Our remaining school wide improvement priorities include:**

1. **School safety-which we address via our school safety team which meets monthly, through debriefing after our monthly drills, and close communication with our School Guardian.**
- 2.

**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.

Social Emotional Behavior Resources - We have a higher percentage of students needing intervention and resources for Mental Health and as a team we are working closely with families and community resources on and off campus.

#### **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: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00