

Manatee County Public Schools

Robert H. Prine Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Robert H. Prine Elementary School

3801 SOUTHERN PKWY W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

Demographics

Principal: Greg Sander

Start Date for this Principal: 7/12/2021

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: C (43%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: D (39%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Robert H. Prine Elementary School

3801 SOUTHERN PKWY W, Bradenton, FL 34205

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

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	72%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Prine Elementary is committed to creating an environment that provides our students a balanced, enriched curriculum that meets our students academic and social/emotional needs. We prepare our students for success in both life and academics by participating in a strong, well-rounded instructional program that meets the needs of the whole child. This strong, well-rounded instructional program incorporates collaboration and collaborative planning practices, analysis of a student data for instructional practices to help close learning gaps and increase student achievement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Prine Elementary sets high standards for academic and social/emotional learning and celebrates the achievement of every child.

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
Sander, Greg	Principal	
Flynn, Scott	Assistant Principal	
Rolewski, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	
Hamlin, Kristen	Reading Coach	
Carey, Christy	Dean	
Garza, Ana	Attendance/Social Work	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/12/2021, Greg Sander

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

723

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

7

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

10

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	104	124	105	133	109	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	53	51	41	80	59	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	331
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	26	6	14	20	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74
Course failure in Math	0	16	3	12	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	9	31	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	26	9	31	21	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/8/2021

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	116	97	117	116	108	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	16	12	1	8	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

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	116	97	117	116	108	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	16	12	1	8	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	16	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

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				35%	52%	57%	37%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	57%	58%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	55%	53%	54%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				45%	63%	63%	48%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	68%	62%	56%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				33%	53%	51%	48%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				26%	48%	53%	39%	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	31%	51%	-20%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	56%	-15%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	52%	-19%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	37%	60%	-23%	62%	-25%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	44%	65%	-21%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	26%	48%	-22%	53%	-27%
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 diagnostic data that is given in the fall winter and spring.

3-5 SDMC District Benchmark assessment data given during Q1, Q2, and 20-21 FSA results.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/10%	92/28.3%	91/47.3%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/10.8%	67/29.9%	66/47%
	Students With Disabilities	11/0%	11/9.1%	10/10%
	English Language Learners	33/9.1%	33/24.2%	33/42.4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/8.9%	92/19.6%	91/40.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/9.2%	67/17.9%	66/43.9%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9.1%	11/0%	10/10%
	English Language Learners	33/6.1%	33/12.1%	33/33.3%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	113/13.3%	114/34.2%	115/36.5%
	Economically Disadvantaged	86/11.6%	87/39.1%	88/39.8%
	Students With Disabilities	17/11.8%	16/18.8%	16/31.3%
	English Language Learners	38/7.9%	37/16.2%	38/15.8%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	112/8.9%	113/20.4%	115/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88/39.8%	88/21.6%	88/44.3%
	Students With Disabilities	17/5.9%	16/37.5%	16/43.8%
	English Language Learners	37/8.1%	36/8.3%	38/21.1%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	98/34.7%	105/36.2%	92/30%
	Economically Disadvantaged	70/31.4%	75/33.3%	75/22.7%
	Students With Disabilities	15/13.3%	15/20%	15/20%
	English Language Learners	38/26.3%	43/25.6%	30/23%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	99/39.4%	105/42.9%	91/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/36.6%	76/39.5%	76/44.7%
	Students With Disabilities	16/18.8%	17/23.5%	15/33%
	English Language Learners	39/38.5%	42/38.1%	30/57%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	102/41.2%	105/32.4%	97/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/39.1%	65/32.3%	67/35.8%
	Students With Disabilities	10/30%	11/18.2%	9/33%
	English Language Learners	41/34.1%	45/26.7%	28/32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	101/36.6%	102/33.3%	95/56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	64/35.9%	62/33.9%	67/49.3%
	Students With Disabilities	10/10%	10/10%	9/22%
	English Language Learners	41/34.1%	42/35.7%	28/46%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	95/34.7%	94/29.8%	95/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63/34.9%	64/28.1%	66/22.7%
	Students With Disabilities	11/18.2%	10/10%	15/13%
	English Language Learners	51/27.5%	48/18.8%	35/9%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	93/35.5%	94/29.8%	94/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/36.1%	62/22.6%	63/34.9%
	Students With Disabilities	8/25%	10/20%	14/21%
	English Language Learners	49/30.6%	50/20%	34/29%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	92/20.7%	92/15.2%	96/29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	61/23%	62/12.9%	63/19%
	Students With Disabilities	9/11.1%	8/0%	14/21%
	English Language Learners	51/17.6%	48/8.3%	35/14%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	21	33		26	28		31				
ELL	25	35	44	46	46	46	18				
BLK	27	20		42	35		24				
HSP	30	37	38	48	52	36	24				
WHT	44	57		60	64		50				
FRL	29	34	44	45	48	50	27				
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	19	58	52	17	38	33	9				
ELL	17	37	31	34	49	29	9				
BLK	25	56	45	37	47	40	14				
HSP	31	45	42	45	56	28	19				
WHT	48	65	73	53	67	47	46				
FRL	32	52	53	41	56	33	21				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	45	47	27	48	41	18				
ELL	22	48	50	36	53	50	9				
BLK	20	53	60	35	61		25				
HSP	30	47	50	41	51	47	24				
MUL	73			55							
WHT	52	60		64	61	42	59				
FRL	34	50	54	45	56	48	34				

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	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	47
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	331
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	30
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	39
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	
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	54
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Bottom quartile students which includes students in the underperforming federal index subgroups are not making learning gains.

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

Student learning gains and L25 learning gains in ELA and math demonstrate the greatest need for improvement.

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

We had two teachers that left during the year because of COVID which were filled with long term subs and a brand new teacher hired out of thier internship. There was a lot of time spent on teaching and reteaching due to the number or substitute teachers and behavior management. Interventions, while attempted, did not create the deired level of learning gains.

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

We had an 11% positive change with our Math L25 gains from 33% to 44%.

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

We used Acaletics math in grades 3-5. We administered the quarterly benchmark assessments and tracked the data and monitored the students progress toward proficiency. We also analyzed the assessment

data to create targeted standards-based lesson for our students. We also had our teachers meet with the district math instructional specialist to create rigorous, standards-based lessons targeted areas of low student achievement levels.

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

- Acaletics (2-5)
- SRA Corrective reading
- Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
- Common formative and summative assessments
- District Quarterly Benchmark assessments
- i-Ready diagnostic and growth checks
- Club ExcEL (3-5)
- Imagine Learning (K-5)
- Next Step Forward in Guided Reading (K-2)
- Targeted Standards-based small group instruction with L25 students
- Small Group instruction based on our sub-group data
- ELL Resource teacher and ELL Specialist work with teachers on strategies for ELL students

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.

- Two instructional coaches
- Summer learning modules focusing on: Learning environment, mini lesson and small group instruction, behavior management and engagement strategies, data binders.
- Learning walks
- Professional development delivered by Acaletics representative

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

- Two instructional coaches
- Summer learning modules focusing on: Learning environment, mini lesson and small group instruction, behavior management and engagement strategies, data binders.
- Sciece tutoring and afterschool robotics program

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Trend data is demonstrating that L25 Math Learning Gains are low

Measurable Outcome:

Math learning gains in bottom 25% will be 62% on the 21-22 FSA Math.
 Increase Standards-based instruction in math in order to increase performance of Students with Disabilities, ELL, Hispanic, and Black/African American.
 Math Achievement on FSA: 62%
 Math Gains: 62%
 Math L25: 62%

Monitoring:

Using an FSA Simulation Score conducted by the SDMC Assessment and Accountability department we will track our school grade to see improvement toward our school grade goal of 62% A.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Scott Flynn (flynns@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Acaletics (2-5) - Teachers will implement the spiral curriculum with fidelity, and will have district Title 1 support to model and coach teachers.
- Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
- Common formative and summative assessments
- District Quarterly Benchmark assessments
- i-Ready diagnostic and growth checks
- Targeted Standards-based small group instruction with L25 students
- Small Group instruction based on our sub-group data
- ELL Resource teacher and ELL Specialist work with teachers on strategies for ELL students

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Student achievement levels in Math will improve on the FSA when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum map and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase Acaletics
2. Have teachers view video of Acaletics being implemented
3. Start the program-Practice instructional routines
4. Provide coaching and feedback
5. Level groups based on student results...Covid allowing

Person Responsible

Scott Flynn (flynns@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Trend data is demonstrating that L25 ELA learning gains are low.

Measurable Outcome: ELA learning gains in bottom 25% will be 62% on the 21-22 FSA ELA. Increase Standards-based instruction in ELA in order to increase performance of Students with Disabilities, ELL, Hispanic, and Black/ African American.
 ELA Achievement on FSA: 62%
 ELA Gains: 62%
 ELA L25: 62%

Monitoring: Using an FSA Simulation Score conducted by the SDMC Assessment and Accountability department we will track our school grade to see improvement toward our school grade goal of 62% A.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- SRA Corrective reading
- Monthly grade-level data meetings (TCT's)
- Common formative and summative assessments
- District Quarterly Benchmark assessments
- i-Ready diagnostic and growth checks
- Club ExcEL (3-5)
- Imagine Learning (K-5)
- Next Step Forward in Guided Reading (K-2)
- Targeted Standards-based small group instruction
- Small Group instruction based on our sub-group data
- ELL Resource teacher and ELL Specialist work with teachers on strategies for ELL students
- Benchmark Advance (K-2)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

SRA has been proven to increase improvement in reading and is also recommended by the district. SRA was implemented last year in our third grade Academy class and 4th and 5th grade classes. Student achievement levels in ELA will improve on the FSA when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum maps and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence-based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers on Benchmark Advance and Literacy Footprints in grades K-2 and SRA Corrective in grades 3-5.
2. Offer intervention support for implementing SRA in the classrooms.
3. Conduct check-ins with teachers to make sure the program is being implemented with fidelity.
4. Conduct progress monitoring bi-weekly for students completing the SRA program

Person Responsible

Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus	1. The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment
Description and Rationale:	2. The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase percentage of third grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Using an FSA Simulation Score conducted by the SDMC Assessment and Accountability department and i-Ready Fall Winter and Spring Diagnostics, we will track our school proficiency to see improvement toward our goal of gaining 3-4 percentage points on ELA proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRA Corrective reading - Next Step Forward in Guided Reading (K-2) - Literacy Footprints <p>SRA has been proven to increase improvement in reading and is also recommended by the district. SRA was implemented last year in our third grade Academy class and 4th and 5th grade classes. Student achievement levels in ELA will improve on the FSA when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the Florida Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum maps and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence-based strategies.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy Footprints small group instruction is a district supported reading resource that has shown improvement in student reading fluency, decoding, and comprehension. Student achievement levels in ELA will improve on the i=Ready Diagnostic when teachers are provided with a targeted support plan to deliver rigorous and engaging instruction aligned with the B.E.S.T. Standards, district power standards, and district curriculum maps and incorporates all of the aforementioned evidence-based strategies.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers on Benchmark Advance and Literacy Footprints in grades K-2 and SRA Corrective in grades 3-5.
2. Offer intervention support for implementing SRA in the classrooms.
3. Conduct check-ins with teachers to make sure the program is being implemented with fidelity.
4. Conduct progress monitoring bi-weekly for students completing the SRA program

Person Responsible Greg Sander (sander@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The primary area of concern is the suspension of students from school. To reduce the number of suspendible offenses we will work on incorporating SEL and community building into our campus and individual classrooms.

To address the SEL needs of our students we are implementing morning meeting and closing circle utilizing the following components in each classroom.

Morning Meeting

- 1. Greeting at the door or on carpet**
- 2. Morning Message**
- 3. Activity/culture building/character strong**
- 4. Mindful minute**
- 5. Schedule for the day**

Closing circle

- 1. Reflection + look forward**
- 2. Sparks + s'mores (camping theme this year)**
- 3. Shout outs**
- 4. Exit song (optional)**

Teachers hold a daily morning meeting following the structure from Responsive Classroom to help gauge students mental state and grow and strengthen the classroom community (peer to peer and peer to teacher). When student conflict occurs (peer to peer or student to staff) mediation practices from Restorative Justice are used to help resolve conflict. Teachers utilize Growth Mindset language and goal setting with students during data chats and daily instruction. Each class does mindful breathing daily (usually during Morning Meeting but also coming back from transitions or other scenarios when needed) and has a Peace/Calm Corner that students can use when their emotions are becoming too strong and hard to manage.

Additionally we are connecting SEL resources from the Character Strong program and building community school-wide by incorporating the following on our morning news.

Monday~ Mindful Monday- Character Strong SEL intro by a counselor

Tuesday~ Trivia Tuesday- last week's trivia winner announced; later trivia will be related to previous vocab or SEL term, etc

Wednesday~ World Wednesday- cultural facts, gestures, traditions explained by a staff, student, etc

Thursday~ Thoughtful Thursday- modeling or video of brain break activity, breathing, calm down strategies, problem solving, etc

Friday~ SEL wrap up- pictures of class practicing the trait or summary of an activity done in a classroom; possibly ask teachers to email counselor about their success with the SEL for the week

Our goal is use multiple trauma informed practices such as increasing a sense of community within the classroom, checking in daily with students, teaching mindfulness practices to help students learn to regulate their emotions appropriately, using Growth Mindset practices to create a paradigm shift within our students, mediating conflict and using restorative justice practices will help reduce referrals and suspensions of students.

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.

We will build strong relationships from the beginning of the year and sustain those relationships throughout the year. Some of the things we will be implementing this year are:

Parent Portal through FOCUS

Open House (Virtual)

Prine Facebook Page

School Website

Schoology (parent and student access)

Family Events (Literacy Night, Math and STEM Night, Breakfast with Santa). These will be held in a virtual platform due to COVID-19.

Parent Conferences (held virtually during COVID-19)

Progress Reports

Blackboard ConnectEd

Meetings (SAC, PFF) (held virtually during COVID-19)

This year we are going 100% Classroom Dojo for parent communication. It has been growing at our school every year with great success. Since we can't have in person events right now, we are stressing the parent communication, class pictures, class videos through the Classroom Dojo app. This will help keep the home school relationship strong.

To address the SEL needs of our students we are implementing morning meeting and closing circle utilizing the following components in each classroom.

Morning Meeting

1. Greeting at the door or on carpet
2. Morning Message
3. Activity/culture building/character strong
4. Mindful minute
5. Schedule for the day

Closing circle

1. Reflection + look forward
2. Sparks + s'mores (camping theme this year)
3. Shout outs
4. Exit song (optional)

Additionally we are connecting SEL resources from the Character Strong program and building community school-wide by incorporating the following on our morning news.

Monday~ Mindful Monday- Character Strong SEL intro by a counselor

Tuesday~ Trivia Tuesday- last week's trivia winner announced; later trivia will be related to previous vocab or SEL term, etc

Wednesday~ World Wednesday- cultural facts, gestures, traditions explained by a staff, student, etc

Thursday~ Thoughtful Thursday- modeling or video of brain break activity, breathing, calm down strategies, problem solving, etc

Friday~ SEL wrap up- pictures of class practicing the trait or summary of an activity done in a classroom; possibly ask teachers to email counselor about their success with the SEL for the week

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

Greg Sander (principal) - communication, expectations, parent and staff relationships, SEL program

Scott Flynn (assistant principal) - communication, expectations, parent and staff relationships, SEL program

Shawn Griffon (school counselor) - PBIS program, Character Strong program, communication, parent and student relationships

Amy Jendro (school counselor) - PBIS program, Character Strong program, communication, parent and student relationships

Christy Carey (SSS) - PBIS program, Character Strong program, communication, parent and student relationships

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00