Marjorie G. Kinnan Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Marjorie G. Kinnan Elementary School

3415 TALLEVAST RD, Sarasota, FL 34243

https://www.manateeschools.net/manatee

Demographics

Principal: Melissa Porco

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2016

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)	78%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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

Marjorie G. Kinnan Elementary School

3415 TALLEVAST RD, Sarasota, FL 34243

https://www.manateeschools.net/manatee

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	63%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

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.

Our mission at Kinnan is to foster success for all children, their families and the community by encouraging high academic standards in a positive, safe environment through hard work, personal responsibility, respect for others, honesty and cooperation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to improve achievement in reading, writing, math, science and build relationships and wellness for all.

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
Hockenbury, Paul	Principal	
Blackmore, Todd	Assistant Principal	
Dinger, David	Administrative Support	
Long, Rae	Teacher, K-12	
Velez, Arlene	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/1/2016, Melissa Porco

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
47

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)	78%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (44%)
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	75	95	92	93	75	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	532
Attendance below 90 percent	0	38	24	26	23	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	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	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	103	101	89	82	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	14	10	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	34	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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

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	103	101	89	82	97	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	578
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	14	10	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	34	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

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

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	52%	52%	57%	51%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	57%	58%	59%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	55%	53%	51%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	63%	63%	55%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	68%	62%	64%	59%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	53%	51%	46%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	48%	53%	45%	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	57%	51%	6%	58%	-1%
	2018	43%	49%	-6%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	56%	-8%	58%	-10%
	2018	49%	51%	-2%	56%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	45%	52%	-7%	56%	-11%
	2018	49%	52%	-3%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	60%	-2%	62%	-4%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	62%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	65%	-17%	64%	-16%
	2018	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
	2018	57%	58%	-1%	61%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	36%	48%	-12%	53%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	44	50	37	47	45	25				
ELL	37	45	38	42	52	55	28				
ASN	63	58		79	67						
BLK	38	43		38	29						
HSP	46	46	43	45	48	54	26				
WHT	60	53	64	59	60	33	52				
FRL	45	48	49	45	48	49	36				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	38	31	29	39	32	33				
ELL	24	40	37	46	44	29	7				
ASN	80	90		93	100						
BLK	39	36		39	55						
HSP	35	45	44	49	42	29	21				
MUL	57			62							
WHT	60	60	45	63	52	50	67				
FRL	45	55	46	51	54	39	36				

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	27	54	56	31	54	39	25				
ELL	26	42	43	42	58	47	14				
ASN	73			100							
BLK	50	50		43	40						
HSP	40	55	48	45	60	46	31				
MUL	27			55							
WHT	63	65	60	61	69	50	57				
FRL	43	52	49	48	57	39	30				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	393
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	45
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	67
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	37
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	46

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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	54
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	47
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.

Science scores continue to decline. Contributing factors include: high rate of teacher absenteeism in testing grades, lack of science instruction, use of vocabulary in primary grades. Lack of science curriculum in all grades except 5th.

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

ELA learning gains decreased by 5% from 2018. This is not a trend. Contributing factors include: high rate of teacher absenteeism in testing grades, failure in grade 4 to maintain the FSA proficiency/ growth of students from prior year, and insufficient instruction at the 5th grade level.

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.

Science scores at the school level were 14% lower than the state. Contributing factors include, high rate of teacher absenteeisim in testing grades, lack of science instruction, use of vocabulary in primary grades. Lack of science curriculum in all grade except 5th.

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

Math gains for the lowest quartile showed the most improvement from 2018. We believe the math used during the gap year required teachers to teach at a deeper level with more rigor, have more time for reteaching and allowed for more flexibility than the previous text used.

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

Attandance and students scoring level 1 on a state assessment.

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

1. Learning Gains in ELA
2. Learning Gains in Math
3. Science Proficiency
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to ELA Learning Gains

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA learning gains at the school level continue to be below the district and state average. Improvement in this area includes students from all subgroups including black and students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA learning gains will improve by 5% as measured by the 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	District curriculum maps and progression guides will be closely followed. All district selected curriculum materials and programs will be utilized with fidelity. Daily remediation will occur with students who did not show gains from the previous year. Monthly progress monitoring will take place to track student progression.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Fidelity to district curriculum plans will result in increased learning gains. Resources used: Wonders ela text, IReady, IXL reading, Accelerate Reading.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Student data will be monitored closely using RTI data, Wonders assessment data and benchmark data.
2. Students who did not make gains from previous year will receive targeted interventions.
3. Grade levels will meet montly for vertical planning.

Person Responsible	Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)

#2. Other specifically relating to Math Learning Gains

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math learning gain percentages continue to fall below the district and state level. Improvement in this area includes all students in all subgroup categories including black and students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome:	Math learning gains will improve by 5% points from 2021 FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of Acaletics Math program in grades 4 and 5.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Acaletics program has been successfully used to show improvement in the area of math at many title one schools in Manatee County.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Participating students in grades 4 and 5 will use the program for 30 minutes each day. As well as implement Math Club strategies.
2. Student data will be monitored monthly and adjustments will be made as needed.
3. Teachers will receive ongoing training to ensure the program is being used with fidelity.

Person Responsible	Todd Blackmore (blackmoret@manateeschools.net)

#3. Other specifically relating to Science Proficiency	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Science scores continue to decrease and fall below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	Science proficiency scores will improve by a minimum of 3% from 2021FSA scores.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics science will be utilized in grades 4 and 5. IXL science will be used daily in grades 2-5. Teachers in grades 2-5 will meet bimonthly to plan science lessons and to incorporate science vocabulary and concepts into other portions of their instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Purposeful planning of science instruction at multiple grade levels should result in improved science scores for this year and future years. The IXL program is enjoyed by students and can be used at home as a way to extend science instruction. Science Acaletics, while new, will provide consistent science instruction to students in grades 4 and 5.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Participating students in grades 4 and 5 will use the HMH Science material and assessments
2. Student data will be monitored monthly and adjustments will be made as needed.

Person Responsible   Paul Hockenbury (hockenbp@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. Bi-montly planning for science by teaches.
2. Use of IXL science by students in grades 2-5.
3. Use of Science Acaletics in grades 4 and 5.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: ELA Learning Gains**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: Math Learning Gains**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Other: Science Proficiency**	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00