

Martin County School District

Felix A Williams 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Felix A Williams Elementary School

401 NW BAKER RD, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/fawes

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Tuthill

Start Date for this Principal: 4/7/2017

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)	42%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Martin 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Felix A Williams Elementary School

401 NW BAKER RD, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/fawes

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	39%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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 Felix A. Williams Elementary School is Every Student, Every Day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Felix A. Williams Elementary School is Empowerment Through Community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Riley, Deborah	Principal	
Torounian, Eileen	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	
Robinson, Donna	Teacher, K-12	
Soviero, Kerry	Teacher, K-12	
Higgins, Kim	Teacher, K-12	
McLeod, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Thomas, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Boogaart, Linda	Teacher, K-12	
Cox, Dee Ann	Teacher, K-12	
Gagliardo, Julianne	Teacher, ESE	IPS Coach- facilitate ESE meetings
Scott, Lauren	School Counselor	Facilitate parent meetings for 504/MTSS; work with students for SEL goals; work with teachers for SEL resources/lessons

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 4/7/2017, Sarah Tuthill

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.*

14

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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

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)	42%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	63	83	77	74	102	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/28/2020

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	94	92	90	110	109	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	9	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	5	19	20	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	0	0	0	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	94	92	90	110	109	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	9	5	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	5	5	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	5	19	20	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	0	0	0	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	64%	58%	57%	68%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	59%	58%	67%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	56%	53%	59%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	72%	65%	63%	74%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	65%	62%	65%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	53%	51%	51%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	58%	53%	63%	55%	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	63%	54%	9%	58%	5%
	2018	64%	57%	7%	57%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
	2018	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
	2018	75%	58%	17%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	58%	16%	62%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	72%	63%	9%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	67%	4%	64%	7%
	2018	71%	64%	7%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	68%	64%	4%	60%	8%
	2018	74%	64%	10%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	53%	12%	53%	12%
	2018	70%	54%	16%	55%	15%
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	29	43	35	46	55	46	44				
ELL	46			77							
BLK	69	60		69	70						
HSP	47	68	57	61	59	38	60				
MUL	73			55							
WHT	67	59	44	75	57	44	73				
FRL	44	54	42	55	51	44	44				
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	41	51	42	44	47	21	35				
ELL	50	60		61	40						
BLK	45	56		50	38		36				
HSP	64	55	50	66	60		71				
WHT	69	59	45	77	66	39	72				
FRL	48	49	42	56	52	41	39				

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	40	53	52	48	58	43	33				
ELL	33			67							
BLK	50	44		62	61						
HSP	62	67		74	79						
WHT	71	69	63	76	61	47	67				
FRL	49	52	49	63	58	53	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	27
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	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	67
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	56
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	64
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	60
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	48
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.

Data reflection is comparing 2018 to 2019 scores for current 2021 same cohort group (gr. 3 in 2019 & current gr. 5 for 2021 upcoming FSA). ELA Students With Disabilities Achievement (41% down to 29%); ELA Students With Disabilities Learning Gains (51% down to 43%); ELA Students With Disabilities Learning Gains L25 (42% down to 35%). Majority of the students in the subgroup were gr. 3 retainers as well and receiving intensive phonics intervention support.

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

Data reflection is comparing 2018 to 2019 scores for current 2021 same cohort group (gr. 3 in 2019 & current gr. 5 for 2021 upcoming FSA). ELA Students With Disabilities Achievement (41% down to 29%); ELA Students With Disabilities Learning Gains (51% down to 43%); ELA Students With Disabilities Learning Gains L25 (42% down to 35%). Majority of the students in the subgroup were gr. 3 retainers as well and receiving intensive phonics intervention support.

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.

Data reflection is comparing 2018 to 2019 scores for current 2021 same cohort group (gr. 3 in 2019 & current gr. 5 for 2021 upcoming FSA). The greatest gap when compared to the state average was in the ELA L25 Percentile (FAWE- 46%/State 53%). This percentile includes the SWD subgroup, which was also the greatest decline in school data. Majority of the students in the subgroup were gr. 3 retainers as well and receiving intensive phonics intervention support.

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

Data reflection is comparing 2018 to 2019 scores for current 2021 same cohort group (gr. 3 in 2019 & current gr. 5 for 2021 upcoming FSA). The data component with the most improvement was in Math Learning Gains with the Black subgroup (38% to 70%). There was a focus on mastery of math foundational skills (base ten, etc) through targeted intervention & layered support within the guided math workshop model.

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

1. ELA Achievement and Learning Gains within the Students With Disabilities subgroup, which was also the ESSA subgroup in CS&I in 2018 data for this year's cohort group.

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

1. ELA Achievement overall grade level for current cohort group
2. ELA Learning Gains within the Students With Disabilities subgroup (ESSA targeted group)
3. ELA Learning Gains L25 within the Students With Disabilities subgroup (ESSA targeted group)
4. Attendance between 90-92% every twenty day count including remote and in person learners
5. Self-Regulation Skills during SEL block

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standards Based Instruction for Learning within ELA in the area of phonics and phonemic awareness. Foundational reading skills are critical to help students become proficient readers. The area of focus was chosen due to the data analysis in ELA scores showing phonics and phonemic awareness is still a challenge for students reading below grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	Grades K-2 Foundations data will show 90% of L25 grade level group scoring 80% proficient at either the mid-point assessment or end of year assessment. Grade 5 ELA L25 Learning Gains for 2021 FSA will increase to 66%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Wilson Foundations Program is implemented in all Grades K-2 ELA classes. The intervention component of the program is being utilized for students needing targeted intervention after the reteaching data showing a gap in the learning. SPIRE Program is implemented in grades 3-5 for students with disabilities subgroup who are reading two grade levels below and demonstrating a deficiency in phonics or phonemic awareness
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Wilson Foundations Program and SPIRE are programs that have been adopted through the ELA adoption process by the MCSD for multi-sensory explicit instruction in phonics.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review student Foundations and/or SPIRE data through the MTSS process to identify areas of improvement in phonics/phonemic awareness.
2. Review Foundations and/or SPIRE data during PLC's for instructional planning.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Standards Based Instruction for Learning within ELA in the area of reading comprehension across all content areas both in fiction and nonfiction grade level text while providing scaffold reading strategies to support readers. Teachers utilizing a variety of print and digital resources to support standards based instruction using grade level text impacts student learning in applying literacy skills across all content areas. The area of focus was identified as a critical need from the data from 2018 scores, because at that time this was an identified ESSA CS&I category. This is the same cohort group from that data collection year.

Measurable Outcome: Improve the ESSA subgroup data from 43% to 45% to continue a positive trend line above the 41% indicator.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Fountas & Pinnell Reading Units of Study- Reader's Workshop Model with scaffold support using Jennifer Saravella Reading Strategies and targeted lessons from the iReady Teacher Toolbox. Content area grade level texts are utilized in Science (Pearson textbook) and Social Studies (Studies Weekly).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The evidence based strategies allow for scaffold support for students who are reading below grade level to teach explicit reading comprehension strategies to successfully access grade level text in both print and digital resources.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small guided reading groups with various texts and reading strategies.
2. Digital textbooks allow for digital scaffold support within grade level text.
3. Review student data through the MTSS process to identify areas of improvement in reading comprehension within fiction and nonfiction text.
4. Review student data during PLC's to determine instructional plans.

Person Responsible

Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Maintain student attendance rate to be between 90-92% at each twenty day student attendance count, which includes both remote and in person learners. Student learning with a direct correlation to reading proficiency is impacted when they are not consistent in attending school. Attendance was identified as a critical need based on current attendance data for the SY20-21 with inconsistent student attendance both as remote learners and in person learners.

Measurable Outcome: Maintain student attendance rate to be between 90-92% at each twenty day student attendance count, which includes both remote and in person learners.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Attendance Works evidence based strategies will be implemented to help educate parents on the importance of regular attendance and the correlation to reading proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strong correlation between consistent attendance and reading proficiency is the rationale for selecting the strategy. Many of the students in the L25 and SWD subgroups typically trend with high absenteeism.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Attendance Reports generated to determine attendance concerns/patterns of absences.
2. School Counselor makes contact with parents via letter and phone call to discuss concerns.
3. MTSS team meets with parents if more than 5 unexcused absences and a pattern is occurring.
4. School Counselor and Administrator involve the School Social Worker and/or District Attendance Officer to assist with home visits and MTSS meetings as needed.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students will learn self-regulation skills through grade level appropriate lessons during daily SEL block. SEL skills taught include growth mindset, deescalation/calming strategies, and mindfulness strategies are important to assist students in being able to access learning. SEL is a district and school-wide initiative.

Measurable Outcome: Reduce discipline referrals by 2% from SY19-20 to SY20-21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative Practices and Sanford Harmony SEL Program are utilized by teachers during the SEL block. Zones of Regulation Program is also used in the Varying Exceptionalities classrooms for the social skills class.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative Practices and Sanford Harmony SEL Program were adopted as the district wide SEL initiatives/programs to be utilized in K-12. Zones of Regulation was implemented through the MCSD ESE Department for students who have social skills on their IEP.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All Instructional Staff trained on Restorative Practices and Sanford Harmony SEL Program.
2. VE Teachers trained on Zones of Regulation Program.
3. All staff trained by School Social Worker on the MCSD Mental Health Wellness Plan.
4. Monitor discipline referrals and MTSS Behavior problem solving to implement behavior strategies with tiered supports.
5. Satisfaction and Engagement Survey Results in the Spring

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The administration team will address the ELA School Improvement priorities by each administrator meeting with all of the students in the L25 subgroup, which includes the SWD subgroup students in grade 5 on a quarterly basis to conduct student data chats. The data chats will serve as a way to connect with students as mentors and help students with having ownership of their learning as well. The data chats are also a way for administrators to work with teachers during the PLC instructional planning sessions and MTSS meetings.

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture for all stakeholders through PBIS activities & events, school-wide spirit days, and a general positive community that is evident in how students and staff interact together on campus. Collaboration among students in the classroom supports student learning. Teachers collaborate on a weekly basis regarding instructional planning. As a school community, one of the primary focus is centered around Social Emotional Learning (SEL). There is a school wide dedicated SEL block each day in which classroom meetings and community building activities are conducted. SEL items are shared in the monthly parent newsletter to support parents with strategies as well. As a staff, we are practicing Motivational Mondays with positive motivation items and self-care strategies. The FAWE vision: Every Student, Every Day is achieved by teachers working together to meet the individual academic and behavior needs of students. The FAWE SAC and PTA work together to provide support needed to help achieve the school goals. Our student clubs are partner together as well as to implement our FAWE Mission: Empowerment Through Community by partnering with local organizations such as Elevate Hope to raise funds and donate food items for the food pantry, which serves many of our families in the community. As well, we participate as a school worldwide initiatives with the Water for Sudan campaign in which we raised funds to donate a well in South Sudan for the village to have clean water. The FAWE school community supports students in need by providing weekly food bags in partnership with the Elks Club and local organizations. We have a strong volunteer base of past students who come back to volunteer in classrooms and adults who volunteer at various school-wide events and classroom activities. We have earned the Golden School Awards for volunteer hours. We connect with local organizations through the Jensen Beach Chamber Education Board and the Education Foundation of Martin County to provide experiences for students to enhance their learning, such as Junior Achievement programs which teach students entrepreneurship. We also partner with local emergency service departments when we conduct outside learning experiments, such as the 4th grade rocket launches. The relationships that are built with community members, local businesses, and families help support and keep the vision and mission of Felix A. Williams Elementary at the forefront of what we do for students on a daily basis.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$400.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21

			0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	School Improvement Funds		\$400.00
			Notes: Foundations Grade Level Student Materials and SPIRE Students Materials			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
Total:						\$400.00