Myakka City Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Myakka City Elementary School

37205 MANATEE AVE, Myakka City, FL 34251

https://www.manateeschools.net/myakka

Demographics

Principal: Carol Ricks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	70%
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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Myakka City Elementary School

37205 MANATEE AVE, Myakka City, FL 34251

https://www.manateeschools.net/myakka

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	No	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Myakka City Elementary School is to provide the Myakka City community with a safe environment where the entire community can thrive academically, emotionally and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Myakka City Elementary faculty & staff are committed to providing students exemplary instruction that nurtures all aspects of a child's development. We will work collaboratively with the families and community members to prepare our students for success with the skills and knowledge required for success in higher education,the workforce, and adulthood.

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
Ricks, Carol	Principal	Oversees the team & leads in goal setting and preparing agenda.
Bickel-Perry, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Analyze assessment data & implement goal plans.
Rivero, Heather	Other	Assists with goal discussion, note taking, & accessing student data needs.
Veldkamp, Debbie	Other	Assists with goal discussion, note taking, & accessing student data needs.
York, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Assist teachers in the implementation of goals, goal discussion,and small group remediation/interventions
Kuehn, Anna	Reading Coach	Assist teachers in the implementation of goals, goal discussion,& small group remediation. Provides PD and curricular support to teachers
Kinyon, Jo Ann	Teacher, K-12	ILT Team Member, Representative for the 4th & 5th Grade Team, Goal Discussion, Data Review, Disseminate Information
Szewczyk, Joe	Teacher, ESE	ILT Team Member, Representative for the Special Areas Team, Goal Discussion, Data Review, Disseminate Information
Yates, Nikki	Teacher, K-12	ILT Team Member, Representative for the K/1 Team, Goal Discussion, Data Review, Disseminate Information
Piper, Faith	Teacher, K-12	ILT Team Member, Representative for the 2/3 Team, Goal Discussion, Data Review, Disseminate Information
Moreau, Maya	Other	Assist teachers in the implementation of goals, goal discussion,and small group remediation/interventions

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Carol Ricks

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.*
3

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

28

Total number of students enrolled at the school

291

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

3

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

3

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	44	44	54	60	44	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	291
Attendance below 90 percent	2	4	4	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	4	2	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	9	6	9	37	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	15	18	9	16	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73

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	3	2	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 9/13/2021

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	37	53	46	58	42	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	290
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	1	0	4	5	9	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	37	53	46	58	42	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	290
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	1	0	3	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	15	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	10	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	2	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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				63%	52%	57%	65%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	57%	58%	60%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	55%	53%	53%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				79%	63%	63%	73%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				81%	68%	62%	78%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71%	53%	51%	74%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	48%	53%	74%	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	60%	51%	9%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	68%	56%	12%	58%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	52%	-3%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	65%	17%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2021					
	2019	74%	60%	14%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	57%	48%	9%	53%	4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

K-2: I-Ready Reading & Math (Fall/Winter/Spring)
3rd-5th: I-Ready Reading & Math (Fall/Winter) FSA ELA/Math (Spring) & NGSSS Science (5th)

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/17.8%	28/39.4%	31/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/10.9%	17/33.3%	20/40%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	1/14.3%	3/42.9%
	English Language Learners	2/10%	2/10.5%	2/10%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/9.7%	23/31.9%	33/50%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/5.6%	12/23.1%	21/42%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	3/42.9%	4/57.1%
	English Language Learners	1/5.3%	1/5%	4/20%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/22.7%	15/30%	20/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/21.6%	11/32.4%	12/35.3%
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1%	2/20%	2/20%
	English Language Learners	2/14.3%	4/28.6%	4/28.6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/7.5%	11/22%	22/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2.7%	7/20.6%	14/41.2%
	Students With Disabilities	2/18.2%	2/20%	3/30%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/7.1%	5/35.7%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	19/29.2%	32/50.8%	26/44.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/16%	20/42.6%	14/32.6%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/11.1%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	1/4.3%	6/25%	5/22.7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/9.4%	25/39.7%	36/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/6.1%	16/34%	22/51.2%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	1/16.7%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	7/29.2%	9/40.9%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/22.7%	18/36%	21/43.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/14.7%	8/25.8%	10/34.4%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8.3%	1/8.3%	2/20%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	7/29.2%	9/40.9%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/19.6%	19/39.6%	27/55.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/15.2%	12/40%	17/56.7%
	Students With Disabilities	2/16.7%	1/9.1%	3/27.3%
	English Language Learners	1/7.7%	5/38.5%	8/61.6%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/41.8%	41/48.2%	40/54.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/24.5%	16/33.4%	17/38.7%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.1%	4/23.5%	3/20%
	English Language Learners	3/11.4%	5/18.5%	7/28%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/37.7%	45/54.9%	44/57.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/21.7%	19/40.4%	23/48.9%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11.8%	4/23.5%	3/20%
	English Language Learners	3/12.5%	7/26.9%	12/48%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/45.7%	32/47%	36/48.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/33.4%	12/28.5%	16/34.7%
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1%	2/12.5%	3/20%
	English Language Learners	6/23%	6/22.5%	5/20%

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	45	55	28	38	31	14				
ELL	29	50	50	45	50	36	15				
HSP	32	52	50	48	52	33	23				
WHT	66	63		73	71		74				
FRL	35	43	57	52	56	41	28				
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	22	58		33	83	80					
ELL	41	55	55	79	95		20				
HSP	39	63	55	79	100						
WHT	70	67		77	71		78				
FRL	53	64	54	73	83	77	56				

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	21	50	40	16	50						
ELL	29	32	33	52	68	50					
HSP	31	37	33	48	63	50					
WHT	78	70		81	82		80				
FRL	56	58	47	71	80	71	69				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

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	38
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	69
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	43
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?

Low Science and ELA proficiency in ELL and SWD subgroups; Historical decline in in Text Based Writing Scores for Grades 4th and 5th; Significant drop in Math Gains for L25; Increased discipline referrals for disruptive behavior and aggression (non-physical)

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance for the 2018-2019 school year was ELA Gains for the L25. Contributing factors include lack of proficiency of the students, discipline issues, and lack of motivation. The Projected Score for 19-20 based on Quarterly Benchmark Data showed an 8 point improvement to 67% from 18-19. Based on the Projected School Grade Data from Quarterly Benchmark Data, the data component that showed the lowest performance was Math L25 Learning Gains. The L25 Math Learning Gains dropped from 71% in 18-19 to a projected score of 47% in 2019-2020. Contributing factors include teacher/student adjustment to a new math curriculum, pacing/timing struggles, and lack of student motivation. These two areas continue to show the greatest need for improvement based on most recent data.

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: Demographic shift due to rezoning; Lack of student engagement strategies during classroom instruction; Gaps in instruction; Language barriers; Disruptive Behavior/Poor Classroom Management

New Actions: PD on Reading and Math interventions; CHAMPS/PBIS Schoolwide/Classroom Behavior Supports; Acaletics K-5; Reflex Math 3-5; Literacy Footprints Intervention Kits; Push-In Support from Certified Staff during Reading/Math Block; Student Goal Setting Initiative/Data Folders; Goal Setting Celebrations

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

Based on 2018-2019 FSA scores vs. 2017-2018 FSA Scores, Math Proficiency showed themost improvement. (73% in 2017-2018 to 79% in 2018-2019)

When comparing the 2018-2019 FSA Scores/School Grade vs. the 2019-2020 School Grade Projection Data, the area showing the most improvement was ELA L25 Learning Gains. Based on Quarterly Benchmark Data, the ELA L25 in 2019-2020 showed an improvement from 59% to 67%.

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

New actions taken by the school in the area of Math Proficiency include Acaletics in Grades 2-5, L25 Mentors, and Push-In support.

Contributing factors to the improvements in ELA L25 include the use of Literacy Footprints Intervention Kits for L25 students, Quarterly Goal Setting Meetings with students/administration, and Reading Mentors.

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

-WIN (Intervention) Time with additional support staff to provide math and reading interventions by highly qualified staff.
-Reflex Math for L25 to improve math fluency skills
-Acaletics K-5 to maintain/increase math proficiency
-Student Data Folders/Goal Setting Celebrations
-Push In Support during Math/ELA block by highly qualified support staff
-Ready LAFS to provide exposure to grade level text for our struggling/below level readers
-Reading/Writing Project (4th & 5th Grade)

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.

-CHAMPS
-Literacy Footprints Training
-Acaletics
-PBIS Rewards
-Increasing Student Engagement in Instruction

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

Acaletics will be implemented in Grades K-5 with additional support by certified staff to help with student groupings and appropriate levels of instruction. Staff will attend PD on CHAMPS. Fidelity walks will be held by administrative team to monitor the implementation of CHAMPS strategies in classrooms. PBIS Rewards will be implemented schoolwide as a positive behavior support system. Literacy Footprints Intervention Kits will be utilized during WIN (Intervention) Time for our ELA L25 students. Reflex Math will be utilized for our L25 Math students to increase math fluency. Teacher Led PD will be provided to allow colleagues to collaborate and share methods utilized in their classroom to increase student engagement during instruction.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing our writing data from the 2019-2020 FSA, we found our fourth and fifth grade students scored a combined average of 6.0 (fourth grade: average of 5.4 and fifth grade: average of 6.4). This is below our district expectation of an average score of 7, on a ten-point scale.
Measurable Outcome:	4th and 5th Grade students will have an average score of 7 or above on Text Based Writing on FSA/Writing for the 2021-2022 School Year.
Monitoring:	Progress on this area of focus will be monitored by WriteScore Assessments during Q1 and Q2. A 3rd assessment will be completed and reviewed by 4th and 5th grade teachers and support staff during collaborative planning.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Anna Kuehn (kuehna@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: • District Reading/Writing Project (4/5) • StoryWorks Differentiated/Paired Text (4/5) • WriteScore Assessment Q1/Q2 • Be A Writer (3rd Grade) • Benchmark Advance/Literacy Footprints (K-2) • Student Data Folders • Quarterly Goal Setting Celebrations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategies listed above will help our students read complex, grade-appropriate text with the intention of writing a response, plan for their writing, and write essays that will score higher on the ten-point rubric.

Action Steps to Implement

Fourth and fifth grade teachers will be trained on the 4/5 Reading/Writing Project (a district developed reading/writing program).

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Bickel-Perry (bickel-perryb@manateeschools.net)

Our reading coach will collaboratively plan with fourth and fifth grade teachers to help initiate the 4/5Reading/Writing Project in fourth and fifth grade classrooms.

Person Responsible	Anna Kuehn (kuehna@manateeschools.net)

Fourth and fifth grade students will take part in the Write Score in late September/ early October and in January 2022. Data produced from this assessment will be analyzed and used to guide instruction.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Bickel-Perry (bickel-perryb@manateeschools.net)

We will have a mock-FSA writing practice in late February for fourth and fifth grade students. Data will be analyzed to find school-wide writing deficits, and instruction will be collaboratively planned planned based on this information.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Bickel-Perry (bickel-perryb@manateeschools.net)

Fourth and fifth grade students will participate in a Writing Scoring Workshop to hone their scoring and writing skills in spring 2022.

Person Responsible Anna Kuehn (kuehna@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The level of student learning gains in math are not consistent with the level of proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	67% of Students will show learning gains on FSA Math.
Monitoring:	Learning gains in Math will be monitored through Acaletics monthly scrimmages, quarterly benchmark assessments, Reflex Math for our L25, and student data folders/goal setting celebrations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Elizabeth Bickel-Perry (bickel-perryb@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: • Acaletics K-5 • I-Ready Math K-3 • Reflex Math (L25 3rd-5th) • Student Data Folders • Quarterly Goal Setting Celebrations
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Due to frequent absences, eLearning, and school closings over the last two school years, our students have many gaps in their math knowledge. The strategies we have chosen help address these gaps in instruction and also allow for students (who are able) to work above grade-level expectations.

Action Steps to Implement

Students K-5, will take part in Acaletics scrimmages (monthly) and need-based instructional groups (each day). Students (1-5) will graph their scrimmage scores to keep track of their progress.

Person Responsible Heather Rivero (riveroh@manateeschools.net)

Students K-3 will participate in iReady, 60-minutes per week. Instruction will be monitored for success by each classroom teacher and instructional support provided when needed.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Bickel-Perry (bickel-perryb@manateeschools.net)

Our Tier 3 students in grade 3-5 will participate in explicit instruction on mastering math facts through the Reflex Math program.

Person Responsible Maya Moreau (hart2m@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Multi-year data illustrates a significant decline in science proficiency in the past 3-5 years.
Measurable Outcome:	57% of students will be proficient in Science as evidenced on the NGSSA Science Assessment for 21-22 SY.
Monitoring:	Quarterly Science Benchmarks, HMH Science Assessments, and Study Island Science will monitor progress towards the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Rivero (riveroh@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategies: • STEM/Agricultural Science in Fine Arts Rotation • Morning Exploration Clubs • Makerspace K-2 • Science/Ag. Science Lab (3rd-5th) • Woz Ed Science Kits • Study Island Science (5th Grade) • Science Supply Closet • HMH/FSSA Review & Practice • Generation Genius (K-5)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have intentionally chosen strategies that are hands-on and/or highly engaging to help give our students (K-5) more meaningful science experiences. We have also chosen strategies for grades 3-5 that incorporate comprehending science-based text to assist in the understanding of of nonfiction text.

Action Steps to Implement

Science standards (not covered in grade-level standards, but tested in grade 5) will be reviewed in our STEM and AgScience Fine Arts classes.

Person Responsible	Temple Bunyak (bunyakt@manateeschools.net)

Students will be selected (3-5, based on need) to attend a morning AgScience club, 1-2 days per week.

Person Responsible	Temple Bunyak (bunyakt@manateeschools.net)

All K-2 students will have Maker's Space time built into their weekly schedule to provide time for science exploration.

Person Responsible	Carol Ricks (ricksc@manateeschools.net)

3-5 students will have an additional AgScience and STEM lab built into their weekly schedule to provide time for science exploration.

Person Responsible	Carol Ricks (ricksc@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When looking at SEL survey data from students (1-5) and school culture/communication data from a school-created parent survey, we found that there was a need for positive behavior supports and improvements in communication regarding behavior, school-wide.

Measurable Outcome:	10% reduction in disruptive & aggressive behavior referrals
Monitoring:	1. CHAMPS 2. PBIS Rewards 3. Student Goal Setting & Achievement Celebrations 1. 2-Day PD/Book 2. Rewards/Incentives provided by Civic & Community Partners- App Purchased prior to Day 1 of school; Tablets to be purchased to make sure ALL staff has access to app. 3. Data Folders/Goal Setting Sheet and Celebration Criteria will be developed by ILT. Celebrations will be planned by Anya Kuehn, Betsy Bickel-Perry, and Heather Rivero 1. Admin, SSS, & Counselor 2. Heather Rivero, SSS 3. Carol Ricks 1. Mid-Q1 2. Mid-Q1 3. One celebration quarterly 1. CHAMPS: 2 Day PD/Book (Fidelity Walks by Admin Team) 2. PBIS Rewards : App (Admin will monitor usage) 3. Student Goal Setting/Data Folders: Data Folders Reviewed During Admin Walk-Throughs
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carol Ricks (ricksc@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS and PBIS Rewards
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	CHAMPS is a research based program which promotes best practices for school-wide behavior management and classroom engagement. This program was selected to encourage common language and behavior expectations and academic engagement throughout the school. PBIS rewards was selected to streamline the student reward process and student behavior data tracking.

Action Steps to Implement	
	CHAMPS fidelity walks (classrooms and common areas - media center, cafeteria, hallways).
Person Responsible	Carol Ricks (ricksc@manateeschools.net)

Need based support/training on PBIS rewards program/app.

Person Responsible Heather Rivero (riveroh@manateeschools.net)

Behavior-based goal setting, all students K-5. Students will select a quarterly behavior goal and track their progress in their data folder.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Bickel-Perry (bickel-perryb@manateeschools.net)

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.

10% reduction in disruptive & aggressive behavior referrals

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.

Myakka City Elementary School supports the needs of the entire child by implementing high quality instruction and interventions driven by data that is available to all. CHAMPS is implemented schoolwide to provide a common language and consistent expectations throughout the entire campus. PBISRewards is utilized as a positive behavior support. ClassTag is utilized to keep the lines of communication open between school and home and help reduce the language barriers between spanish speaking families and the school with the translation tool. Morning meetings will be held in every classroom to set the tone for the day and create positive relationships in the classroom community.

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

Debbie Veldkamp: School Counselor (Morning Meeting & CharacterStrong Coordinator/Monthly SEL lessons)
Heather Rivero: Student Support Specialist (PBIS Rewards Implementation Support)

Betsy Bickel-Perry: Assistant Principal (Social Media Coordinator and Class Tag Coordinator)
Betsy Bickel-Perry, Anya Kuehn, and Heather Rivero: Quarterly Goal Setting Celebration Planning

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**