Manatee County Public Schools

Oneco Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Oneco Elementary School

5214 22ND STREET CT E, Bradenton, FL 34203

https://www.manateeschools.net/oneco

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 6/14/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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: D (40%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 7/27/2021.

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

Oneco Elementary School

5214 22ND STREET CT E, Bradenton, FL 34203

https://www.manateeschools.net/oneco

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 7/27/2021.

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 Oneco Elementary School is to advocate and provide a safe environment where families are inspired to achieve success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to build relationships in order to motivate and educate children to excel in their chosen paths; therefore becoming responsible citizens and contributors to their communities.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Nicole	Principal	Responsibilities and duties as the school principal are: Teacher Evaluation Facilitate school leadership and improvement Support staff and student Collect, analyze, and organize data Monitor school-wide core and supplemental curriculum Facilitate/lead professional development Monitor school-wide PBIS Facilitate collaborative planning
Hicks, Tori	Assistant Principal	Responsibilities and job duties for the assistant principal are: Teacher Evaluation Monitor and participate as administrator of MTSS ILT/Data team member Administrator for textbook inventory Instructional leader Facilitate collaborative planning Collect, analyze, and organize data Monitor school-wide PBIS/SEL Support staff and students
Erikzon, Karen	Assistant Principal	Responsibilities and job duties of the assistant principal are as follows: Teacher Evaluation Support staff and students Administrator for test administration Community and Business Partner Outreach Monitor and maintain data for Acaletics Math Instructional leader Facilitate collaborative planning Collect, analyze, and organize data
Brigance, Cyndi	Instructional Coach	Instructional leader Facilitate professional development sessions with teachers Facilitate collaborative planning Support instruction in the classroom with teachers and students

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/14/2020, Nicole Williams

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

42

Total number of students enrolled at the school

530

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	93	86	75	109	76	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	41	25	26	38	26	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	178
One or more suspensions	7	12	14	9	11	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	50	18	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	51	27	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	7	62	46	75	43	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	283

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	7	22	26	54	28	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

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	15	0	0	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

Tuesday 6/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	102	82	108	101	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	56	31	46	54	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	11	17	15	10	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	7	11	8	15	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - 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	102	82	108	101	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	56	31	46	54	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239
One or more suspensions	11	17	15	10	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	13	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	7	11	8	15	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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 Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				24%	52%	57%	24%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				43%	57%	58%	41%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	55%	53%	50%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	63%	63%	47%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	68%	62%	57%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				39%	53%	51%	59%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				24%	48%	53%	29%	49%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	26%	51%	-25%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	26%	56%	-30%	58%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				
05	2021					
	2019	19%	52%	-33%	56%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	36%	60%	-24%	62%	-26%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	65%	-9%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	22%	48%	-26%	53%	-31%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring tools used were iReady ELA & Math for grades K-5 (Fall), K-2 (Winter & Spring). District benchmark assessments were used for progress monitoring for grades 3-5 (Winter & Spring).

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22%	10%	12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	10%	12%
	Students With Disabilities	24%	0%%	17%
	English Language Learners	4%	0%	0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7%	8%	16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7%	8%	16%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	0%	8%
	English Language Learners	4%	5%	0%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	22%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	22%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	11%	11%
	English Language Learners	0%	12%	25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4%	13%	29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4%	13%	29%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	6%	17%
	English Language Learners	4%	12%	0%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6%	29%	21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6%	29%	21%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	5%	20%
	English Language Learners	2%	17%	12%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	26%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	26%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	17%%	22%	25%
	English Language Learners	13%	22%	19%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	28%	22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	28%	22%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	8%	12%	12%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	14%	40%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	40%	37%
	Students With Disabilities	4%	10%	6%
	English Language Learners	5%	27%	27%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%	24%	34%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13%	34%	34%
	Students With Disabilities	6%	7%	0%
	English Language Learners	6%	26%	22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	28%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	28%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	7%	7%
	English Language Learners	6%	26%	28%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students		24%	20%
	Economically Disadvantaged		24%	20%
	Students With Disabilities		0%	0%
	English Language Learners		15%	15%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	24	30	30	38						
ELL	18	35		42	56		32				
BLK	22	41		49	59		23				
HSP	24	36		44	56		33				
WHT	43	50		59	70		64				
FRL	25	34	33	48	62	69	34				
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	8	30	44	23	45	36	24				
ELL	18	45	42	38	54	50	18				
BLK	13	43	40	36	50	27					
HSP	22	40	38	40	52	35	21				

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
MUL	30			50							
WHT	43	54		65	79		69				
FRL	21	43	53	41	57	34	22				
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	5	30	43	22	48	47	21				
ELL	15	45	52	43	52	46	14				
BLK	14	36		34	53	73	29				
HSP	23	47	50	49	53	48	21				
WHT	32	31		56	70		50				
FRL	21	41	49	45	57	62	25				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Across grade levels, our ELL, SWD, African American, and Hispanic subgroups underperformed based on proficiency expectations in ELA, math, and science. These students are represented within our L25 percentile in ELA and math. In addition, 4th-grade math, 3rd-5th grade ELA and science underperformed during the 2020-2021 school year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The learning gains for the lowest 25th percentile in ELA had the greatest decline. The factors that contributed to this decline were the gaps in instruction lost during the spring 2020 transition to a remote learning platform, inconsistent standards-based planning, and inconsistent instruction. Fourth grade ELA achievement decreased ten percentage points from the 18-19 FSA to the Q2 district benchmark.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing factors include attendance rates due to Covid-19, gaps due to remote learning during the spring of 2020, and gaps in science instruction across grade levels. Contributing factors in fourth grade included challenges including the loss of a teacher. New actions that will be taken to address this need for improvement are deliberate standards-based planning, intentional small group instruction based on formative progress monitoring data, and monthly data chats with staff and students to adjust instruction for learning gaps.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Learning gains in fourth and fifth-grade math grade achievement demonstrated small gains but showed the most improvement. Fifth grade demonstrated a comparable increase in achievement from Qtr. 2 benchmarks from 18-19 at 27% to 20-21 at 41%. Using i-Ready math diagnostic data, fourth grade showed 117% growth in students making typical growth or 60% of the students, and 74% made annual stretch growth which is explained as more than a year's worth of growth. 80% of the fourth-grade students improved their placement. In fifth grade, 94% of the students made typical growth.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The implementation of Acaletics with fidelity prioritized math instruction. Through the Acaletics protocol, teachers identified gaps in learning through students' monthly progress monitoring assessments, reviewed standards taught in a spiral review, and provided targeted instruction for learning gaps using benchmark, progress monitoring, and classroom formative quick check assessments.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Learning acceleration will be implemented through data-based targeted instructional interventions during small group instruction. Through collaborative planning and data analysis of ongoing formative assessments, instructional staff will target learning gaps for additional support. Acceleration will occur through ongoing spiral reviews and rigorous support.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

School leaders will facilitate individual professional development plans designed to provide teachers with differentiated new learning that applies relevant practices to their classroom experiences. Developing these plans will allow teachers to make the greatest impact on student learning, become actionable progress toward meeting district organizational goals, and provide real-world opportunities to experience authentic learning for purposeful applications. Specific professional development on content knowledge, program fidelity, and responding to student data will be provided.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Staff will be building capacity for sustainable improvement by engaging in purposeful and intentional collaborative planning with instructional leaders, will build upon current learning by developing meaningful professional development plans related to their classroom practices, and will build capacity in facilitating gradual release practices to increase student engagement, ownership, and accountability.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Classroom assignments lack rigor and/or not aligned to the grade level standards. Teams will participate in facilitated weekly collaborative planning sessions with ILT support. Student achievement will increase in all content areas through support in planning standards-based lessons. Instructional planning will include planning protocols designed to build teacher capacity for understanding all aspects of student rigor including conceptual understanding, procedural skills, and opportunities for skill application and students justifying their answers.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 40% of students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science as measured by state assessments through learning experiences aligned with grade level standards/expectations.
Monitoring:	ILT will participate in grade level discussions during planning. Lesson plans will be submitted and reviewed by administration weekly to ensure plans include rigorous student tasks/assignments. ILT will monitor evidence of pre-planning protocols, during planning protocols grounded in identifying resources grounded in the standards, and post planning protocols aligned to tasks with specific "look fors" and in providing feedback.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional leadership team will review lesson plans and conduct weekly walkthroughs to observe classroom student tasks/assignments aligned to grade level standards. Data will be collected and analyzed using the Teacher evaluation system, district benchmark assessments, Next Steps Running Records, iReady, and common formative assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School data has shown there is a disconnect between student tasks/assignments and grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

ILT facilitate collaborative planning.
ILT support small group instruction.
Monthly data chats with students and staff.
Monthly progress monitoring of data with classroom teachers, ESE teachers, Reading Coach, and ELL teacher.
Administration will monitor instruction through walk throughs, calibration walks, and lesson plans.
Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students need more opportunities for collaborative discussions or productive struggle. Instructional framework, GRR, will provide appropriate pacing for students to engage more in independent/collaborative practice.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 40% of students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science as measured by state assessments through learning experiences aligned with grade level standards/expectations.
Monitoring:	Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted by admin, Reading Coach, and ILT to observe the transfer of collaborative conversations and planning to classroom instruction specifically focusing on student engagement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Williams (williamsn@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional framework, Gradual Release of Responsibility, will be planned during collaborative planning and identified in lesson plans.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	GRR provides several scaffolds through explicit teaching of thinking strategies to indendepent practice to meet grade level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

ILT will provide PD for lesson structure to include GRR.
Staff will participate in professional development focused on research-based practices.
ILT will facilitate model GRR during planning.
Provide classroom materials and supplies to increase student engagement and learning using the instructional framework.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lack of training, participation, and consistency with implementing PBIS plan with school community. School data shows a high number of referrals for student behavior.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, there will be a decrease in the number of referrals by 30%.
Monitoring:	Referral data will be reviewed during State-of-the-School meeting with GET, ILT, school counselors, and Student Support Specialist. Distribution of "Cougar Cash" will be monitored by Student Support Specialist and Behavior Tech. Student Support Specialist and ILT members will monitor the facilitation of CHAMPS within the PBiS framework in it's development and implementation of classroom management and procedures.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Erikzon (erikzonk@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Review report cards quarterly, ClassDojo, agendas, positive recognition of students, community circles, and FOCUS data will be used to adjust strategies of implementation of the PBIS system. Purposefull People will continue to be implemented and will include SEL lessons in the classroom. Champs protocols implemented and the use of community circles.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	School referral data has inconsistency in participation of PBIS and other classroom management strategies. A school-wide emphasis on positive behavior, SEL, and character development will provide students more positive opportunities to continue learning throughout the school day. Community circles promote positive relationships with students and teachers and is proactive strategy to improve classroom behavior.

Action Steps to Implement

School based PBIS and CHAMPS training.
Community circles
Incorporate SEL in content area lessons.
Behavior Tech will support student learning/behavior in the classrooms. (monitor, redirect, model, teach, and practice)
Staff will participate in a book study to increase knowledge to include SEL in lessons (lesson plans).

Person Responsible	Karen Erikzon (erikzonk@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lack of home to school connection that supports and reinforces student learning in all content areas.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, parent involvement will increase by 10% as evident by parent participation for school events (SAC, evening events, etc.), parent feedback (surveys), and communication (agendas, phone calls, class apps).
Monitoring:	Parent sign-in sheets, teacher phone call logs, agendas, surveys will be used to monitor parent involvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tori Hicks (hickst@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Create positive relationships with parents and families through phone calls, agendas, invitations to participate in school events, SAC, surveys, etc. will be used to determine next steps to increase parent engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Establishing a positive relationship with parents and families will increase parent involvement in school and their child's learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Invite parents to Parent Information nights to provide standards-based activities and resources to support students at home in ELA, Math, and Science.
School/Classroom newsletters, homework, surveys, and class communication apps to support student learning and communication.

Person Responsible	Tori Hicks (hickst@manateeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student data indicated by various District and State assessments resulted in increases in academic areas, however, ELA that did not resulting additional opportunities to close the achievement gap in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	By May 2022, 40% of students will score proficient in ELA, Mathematics, and Science as measured by state assessments through learning experiences aligned with grade level standards/expectations.
Monitoring:	Teachers will be using writing strategies to integrate writing across content areas. A schoolwide writing wall will model a showcase of examples of student writing across grade levels. This display will promote writing as an engagement strategy and as an example of schoolwide participation in the process of writing instruction and application. This showcase will be monitored monthly with established expectations and look fors.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karen Erikzon (erikzonk@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional leadership team will writing rubrics, teacher feedback, and evidence of alignment to standards based instruction. Writing to learn and learning to write shared exemplars providing evidence of using writing to engage learning and facilitate higher order thinking through application.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Writing is a higher order thinking strategy that engages students in the practice of metacognitive development that is a high impact strategy (.69 ES) (Hattie, 2011), opportunities for feedback (.75 ES), and student centered teaching (.54 ES). The process of writing will improve the overall ELA outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

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.

Building a positive school culture and environment will start with school administration. School administration motivate staff and students by incorporating a school theme - "One Team, One Goal!" to build positive relationships with staff, students, parents, families, and community. School community will be celebrated through the year (positive affirmations, student/staff recognition, PBIS, Purposefull People luncheon, etc.). Parent Liaison and the Graduation Enhancement Tech will work together with families, community business partners, and community to increase involvement and build stronger relationships. The Parent Liaison will promote, communicate, and encourage school stakeholders to participate in school activities.

Additionally, Oneco Elementary receives support with implementing SEL to build a more positive environment through the School Climate Transformation Grant Program. This initiative focuses on the revision of Behavioral MTSS Framework, development of an Implementation Rubric, and the implementation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 programming based on the school's unique data. The grant involves a number of stakeholders through several key actions including the School Climate Task Force for strategic planning, and focus groups to gather school climate data. Additionally, with this grant, Oneco will continue to implement a school-wide SEL curricula.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

All school stakeholders will play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at school. Stakeholders are expected to respond to students in a positive manner and participate in PBIS. Staff and students are encouraged to celebrate each other and promote self-care to maintain a positive environment for all.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning				$172,631.03
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG	1.3	$74,210.83
			Notes: Facilitated weekly collaborative planning sessions to involve an estimated 40 teachers with activities occurring 25 weeks for two hours each week. Teachers will be paid an average hourly rate of $37.00.			
	6400	210-Retirement	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$8,029.61
			Notes: Retirement benefits factored at the board-approved rate of 10.82%.			
	6400	220-Social Security	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,677.13
			Notes: Social Security factored at the board-approved rate of 7.65%.			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$742.11
			Notes: Workers Compensation factored at the board-approved rate of 7.65%.			
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$63,164.85
			Notes: School Improvement Specialist will facilitate professional development and collaborative planning with grade level teachers.			
	6400	210-Retirement	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$6,834.44
			Notes: Retirement benefits factored at the board-approved rate of 10.82%.			
	6400	220-Social Security	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,832.11
			Notes: Social Security factored at the board-approved rate of 7.65%.			
	6400	231-Health and Hospitalization	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$8,369.34
			Notes: Health Insurance factored at the board-approved rate of 13.25%.			
	6400	232-Life Insurance	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$138.96
			Notes: Life Insurance factored at the board-approved rate of .22%.			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$631.65
			Notes: Workers Compensation factored at the board-approved rate of 7.65%.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	510-Supplies	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,500.00
			Notes: Supplies needed to suppport student learning.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**				**$50,937.72**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5200	150-Aides	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$38,316.32

			Notes: The Behavior Tech will support students with changing behaviors. The Behavior Tech will monitor and mentor students throughout the school day in effort to reduce out-of- school suspensions, stress and frustration.			
	5200	210-Retirement	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$4,145.83
			Notes: Retirement benefits factored at the board-approved rate of 10.82%.			
	5200	220-Social Security	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$2,931.20
			Notes: Social Security benefits factored at the board-approved rate of 7.65%.			
	5200	231-Health and Hospitalization	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,076.91
			Notes: Health Insurance benefits factored at the board-approved rate of 7.65%.			
	5200	232-Life Insurance	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$84.30
			Notes: Life Insurance benefits factored at the board-approved rate of .22%.			
	5200	240-Workers Compensation	0261 - Oneco Elementary School	UniSIG		$383.16
			Notes: Workers Compensation benefits factored at the board-approved rate of 1%.			
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement**				**$0.00**
5	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$237,357.50**