H. S. Moody Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/moody

Demographics

Principal: Natalie Jadid

Start Date for this Principal: 8/2/2021

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: C (47%)
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 was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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

H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/moody

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	76%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Manatee County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

Moody Elementary is an inclusive community who values collaboration, high expectations, and independent thinking to develop tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for students to use their thinking and problem solving skills to persevere in meeting their goals.

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
Baker, Maidie	Principal	The Leadership Team will meet monthly and recap what we have been discussing in bi-weekly data teams. The team will also monitor the fidelity of core reading instruction, intervention and acceleration. The Leadership Team will also lead committees and school-wide professional development and/or any training related to effective instruction.
Francies, Krista	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is part of the school's ILT and supports the 5th grade team in collaborative planning and instructional support. She also facilitates the school's Acaletics program and is the MTSS facilitator.
Chapin-Clarke, Emily	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Mrs. Clarke is the school's interventionist. She supports Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention across all grade levels. She is a member of the school's ILT and also serves as the Test Coordinator.
Vicencio, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Vicencio supports core literacy instruction across all grade levels. She is a member of the ILT and the MTSS team. She supports third grade in collaborative planning and instructional support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 8/2/2021, Natalie Jadid

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

585

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.

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	96	88	101	111	86	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	7	5	4	11	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	15	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	8	14	27	13	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	48	37	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	129
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	40	23	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	15	28	31	24	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	2	4	31	18	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/4/2021

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	62	88	86	96	80	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	5	25	14	18	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	9	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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	62	88	86	96	80	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	497
Attendance below 90 percent	5	25	14	18	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	5	3	9	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	10	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
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				36%	52%	57%	42%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	57%	58%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	55%	53%	47%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	63%	63%	52%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				56%	68%	62%	54%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	53%	51%	41%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	48%	53%	48%	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	33%	56%	-23%	58%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	52%	-15%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	44%	60%	-16%	62%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	56%	65%	-9%	64%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	60%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	32%	48%	-16%	53%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady is the progress monitoring tool used to compile the data below for K-2. 3rd-5th Grade Math and ELA as well as Fifth Grade science data was generated from District Benchmark Assessment and FSA scores.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12/23%	25/28%	18/21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/19%	11/18%	20/32%
	Students With Disabilities	3/27%	3/27%	3/27%
	English Language Learners	6/18%	4/12%	10/31%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21/24%	16/18%	35/41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/20%	7/11%	19/31%
	Students With Disabilities	3/30%	2/17%	2/18%
	English Language Learners	6/20%	12/24%	10/31%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/18%	24/26%	16/18%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/15%	14/23%	20/36%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	3/14%	3/13%	8/36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8/9%	21/23%	32/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/5%	12/20%	18/33%
	Students With Disabilities	1/8%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	17/30%	8/36%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61/34	25/26%	63/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/34%	18/27%	16/24%
	Students With Disabilities	8/20%	6/23%	5/19%
	English Language Learners	13/23%	7/19%	6/15%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/30%	39/40%	36/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/29%	24/36%	20/30%
	Students With Disabilities	6/23%	6/23%	8/31%
	English Language Learners	9/24%	14/38%	15/37%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/42%	19/26%	17/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/38%	12/24%	10/18%
	Students With Disabilities	2/12%	1/7%	1/7%
	English Language Learners	11/39%	6/24%	11/24%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/42%	25/33%	43/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/41%	16/30%	33/57%
	Students With Disabilities	5/28%	5/31%	9/60%
	English Language Learners	12/43%	8/30%	16/55%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/30%	25/29%	21/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/27%	12/23%	10/18%
	Students With Disabilities	3/14%	5/23%	6/27%
	English Language Learners	4/15%	4/15%	3/11%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24/28%	16/19%	21/24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/24%	8/16%	11/20%
	Students With Disabilities	5/23%	2/10%	14/18%
	English Language Learners	5/19%	1/4%	5/18%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/18%	19/23%	13/16%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/18%	9/18%	6/12%
	Students With Disabilities	1/4%	7/35%	2/10%
	English Language Learners	1/4%	4/15%	1/4%

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	17	36	36	35	36	45	10				
ELL	15	29		38	46	70	4				
BLK	17	21		32	14		15				
HSP	20	37	33	37	39	62	6				
MUL	35			44							
WHT	37	40		46	30		35				
FRL	20	28	33	35	24	23	14				
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	16	34	36	24	39	30	22				
ELL	24	40	44	39	54	45	16				
BLK	19	31	50	27	41	40					

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
HSP	33	48	36	47	58	40	37				
MUL	42	46		58	62						
WHT	49	58	55	63	59		48				
FRL	35	49	46	48	56	37	31				

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	43	43	37	54	43	52				
ELL	22	38	44	39	40	32	17				
BLK	22	44	46	33	38	38	22				
HSP	40	46	42	52	55	32	46				
MUL	33			56							
WHT	60	64	58	65	64		67				
FRL	38	49	45	49	52	38	42				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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

English Language Learners	
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	20
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	37
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	38
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
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?

There are several trends that emerge across all grade levels, subgroups, and content areas. The first is low overall proficiency. This is particularly highlighted in ELA in which no grade level scored higher than 25% proficiency. There is a large decline in the reporting categories of craft and structure and language and editing.
Math proficiency scores are also low, with 4th grade being the one grade level with higher levels of proficiency than the other grade levels at 56%. Learning gains are also low across all grade levels, all content areas, and all subgroups. A subgroup of particular concern is ESE students in which 0% have made learning gains in the last few years.

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

ELA proficiency demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. Learning gains in ELA have also been an area of need for improvement. In particular, the areas of craft and structure as well as language and editing demonstrate great declines in ELA. In math the greatest areas of decline are in the reporting category of Operations and Algebraic thinking.

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

An analysis of summative and formative assessment data indicates there is not adequate student accountability for independent application of reading and writing skills and strategies. While explicit and modeled instructional practices are consistent across most classrooms, student application of the skills modeled is inconsistent.

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

There were no areas that demonstrated considerable improvement based on progress monitoring or 2019 state assessment data. Fourth grade math proficiency was one area of improvement according to 2019 state assessment data. However, beginning of the year 2021 progress monitoring data did not indicate the same strength.

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

Improvements in 4th grade math proficiency could be attributed to sustained, facilitated collaborative planning that took place in 2020-21 school year.

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

Students need increased exposure to grade level texts with accountability systems in place to monitor students' independent application of skills and strategies taught; and, scaffolding provided so that students can access and work with these texts. Teachers need professional development that supports differentiation and scaffolding techniques that can be employed to support students' work with grade level texts.

Based on the reporting categories which show the greatest decline in both ELA and math, students are declining in their ability to employ analysis. In math this appears in the decline in the reporting category of operations and algebraic thinking in which students are requried to make sense of word problems in order to determine which operation is most appropriate to solve the problem. In ELA this is apparent in the decline in the reporting category of craft and structure which requires students to analyze text structures and then apply them to enhance comprehension of grade level texts.

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.

Professional development will be provided to support teachers use of differentiation and scaffolding to support students' independent application of skills and strategies taught with grade level texts. Professional development will also be provided to support teachers in enhancing students' metacognition and analysis of both texts in ELA and in math word problem solving.

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

The school will also implement a schoolwide student data goal setting and tracking system. Teachers will develop individual student data folders to support students' accountability and understanding of their own data and progress toward proficiency with grade level content.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Lack of school-wide instruction cohesiveness and effectiveness in Tier I instruction. This is based on data from; Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, Grade Level Planning Meeting documentation.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 40% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA and Science and 50% of the students will score satisfactorily in Math as measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.
Monitoring:	An Instructional Leadership Team member will facilitate weekly collaborative planning with grade-level teams, which include ESE and ELL instructors, as well as present school-wide Professional Development that is based on current data. This work will ensure students receive consistent effective standards-based instructional delivery in all academic areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Various data will be collected: Teacher Evaluation System, PMRN (K), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, Grade Level Planning Meeting documentation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research and data from successful turnaround schools has shown that purposeful and facilitated planning makes a positive impact on students' abilities in comprehending the grade level standards. It is during the planning sessions that the connection between explicit teaching of the thinking strategy and accountability strategies for students' independent application of the thinking strategy will continue to be reinforced.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will be provided with facilitated planning opportunities that will occur both before and after the students' school day.

Person Responsible	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate initial and on-going professional development for the instruction delivery framework (GRR) for all grades K-5 to include productive struggle and student accountability to independent application of skills and strategies in grade-level work.

Person Responsible	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

Highly Effective/effective teachers will facilitate the planning of the instruction delivery framework (GRR) for all grades K-5 to meet the needs of grade levels with the inclusion of ESE and ELL.

Person Responsible	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

Provide research-based classroom materials and resources that support student learning in the instructional framework.

Person Responsible	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Responsive student-driven instruction that is focused on developing students' metacognition and monitoring for meaning as they read is a researched-based approach which focuses on engaging academics, an emphasis on students' self awareness of understanding as they read, and students accountability to comprehending grade level text. This evidence-based approach is associated with higher quality instruction that has led to students' increase in achievement levels in reading. We have identified a lack of student application of strategies for monitoring for meaning in grade level texts.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 40% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA and 60% of students will make learning gains in ELA as measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.
Monitoring:	Measurable outcomes will be monitored through student writing (K-5), District Benchmark Assessments, DRA 2.0, Next Steps, Fountas and Pinnell Running Records, Grade Level Common Assessments, analyzing student work with grade-level rubrics, lesson plans, I-Ready, and Grade-Level Planning Meeting Documentation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional focus on students' skills in monitoring for meaning as they read. Professional Development will be provided to explicitly teach instructors the words and actions needed to guide students through strategic next steps and goal setting for each academic area.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Student data indicated by various District and State assessments show minimal learning gains in ELA and math. Evidence shows that student involvement in data monitoring and goal setting leads to increases in learning gains.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be provided to support teachers in learning specific strategies to teach students to monitor for meaning as they read grade level text.

Person Responsible Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

Through grade-level collaborative meetings facilitated by an Instructional Leadership Team member, the plan for the next steps for response teaching (strategic grouping/conferencing) will be developed and implemented.

Person Responsible Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

A schoolwide instructional routine to teach students to monitor for meaning will be developed and employed in all classrooms.

Person Responsible Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Responsive student-driven instruction is a researched-based approach to both teaching and discipline which focuses on engaging academics, developmental awareness, positive community, and effective management. This evidence-based approach is associated with higher quality instruction that has led to students' increase in achievement levels in both reading and mathematics in addition to improved school climate. We have identified a lack of systematic feedback and goal setting with students after analysis of various data and a lack of systematic teacher response to students' specific academic needs.
Measurable Outcome:	By June 2022, 40% of the students will score satisfactory in ELA and Science and 50% of the students will score satisfactorily in Math as measured by state assessments through grade appropriate learning experiences aligned with grade level standards.
Monitoring:	Measurable outcomes will be monitored through District Benchmark Assessments, Grade-Level Planning Meeting Documentation, and MTSS data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	A school-wide system for individual student feedback and goal setting will be implemented. Each student will have an individual data folder and we will implement a timeline for student data chats corresponding with key school, district and state data points throughout the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), working toward personal and academic goals aligns with the core SEL competency of self-management relating to impulse control, stress management, self-discipline, self-motivation, and organizational skills.

Action Steps to Implement

The ILT will create data folders for each grade level that include school-wide data points.

Person Responsible	Maidie Baker (baker2m@manateeschools.net)

The ILT will provide professional development on the effective use of data folders as part of student data conferences.

Person Responsible	Maidie Baker (baker2m@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.

Primary area of concern is support for general education students with large numbers of behavioral 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.

The school has instituted an MTSS-B system to monitor and intervene for students whose behavior is negatively impacting achievement. Each grade level team monitors grade level discipline data and identifies students for whom Tier 1 behavior management and discipline strategies are not working. These students are identified for MTSS-B focus by the ILT and the MTSS facilitator. The MTSS team meets weekly to review Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior strategies and make decisions to support students.
The school employs a PBIS model in which students' positive behavior is rewarded and recognized. There is a positive behavior referral initiative to highlight students whose behavior is successful.
The school will implement professional development for teachers to enhance their Tier 1 behavior and classroom management skills to further build positive school culture and environment.

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

grade level teams-review grade level discipline data and refer students to MTSS-B
ILT-reviews school-wide discipline data to determine Tier 2 and 3 interventions for students

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00