

Manatee County Public Schools

Louise R Johnson K 8 School Of International



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	21
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	27

Louise R Johnson K 8 School Of International Studies

2121 26TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

Demographics

Principal: Anthony Losada

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
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)	71%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (72%) 2016-17: A (67%)
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	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Louise R Johnson K 8 School Of International Studies

2121 26TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

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)
Combination School KG-8	No	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	74%

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.

Mission statement: Our mission is to inspire students to achieve academic excellence, embrace global diversity, and become lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision statement: Johnson K-8 School of International Studies will empower students to live the International Baccalaureate Learner Profile, teach the importance of social and emotional competencies, and foster a caring community of compassionate and respectful learners. Together, students and staff will aspire to be the positive change in our society.

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
Losada, Anthony (Tony)	Principal	Ensure a safe learning environment, set performance goals for students and staff, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, oversee school budget, hire staff, and oversee facilities
Vos, Adrienne	Assistant Principal	To provide the necessary leadership and vision to create an atmosphere conducive to student learning at the highest possible levels and to assume responsibility for the school's operation.
Anges, Kali	Assistant Principal	To provide the necessary leadership and vision to create an atmosphere conducive to student learning at the highest possible levels and to assume responsibility for the school's operation.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 1/7/2019, Anthony Losada

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

67

Total number of students enrolled at the school

898

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

8

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

14

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	65	67	72	68	81	65	162	154	134	0	0	0	0	868
Attendance below 90 percent	23	23	24	22	21	24	50	53	26	0	0	0	0	266
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	4	3	6	2	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	3	3	7	9	1	8	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	13	12	6	19	14	0	0	0	0	85
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	16	12	5	15	8	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	18	21	13	12	6	19	14	0	0	0	0	104

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	1	4	3	4	5	8	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	39

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/10/2021

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	64	65	67	84	67	89	157	150	160	0	0	0	0	903
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	12	8	11	10	12	14	11	0	0	0	0	92
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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	7	18	9	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	20	13	0	0	0	0	61

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	3	5	7	13	6	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	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	64	65	67	84	67	89	157	150	160	0	0	0	0	903
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	12	8	11	10	12	14	11	0	0	0	0	92
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	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	14	7	18	9	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	20	13	0	0	0	0	61

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	3	5	7	13	6	0	0	0	0	34

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
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				72%	58%	61%	74%	55%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				65%	57%	59%	62%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	52%	54%	58%	48%	52%
Math Achievement				82%	64%	62%	78%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains				74%	63%	59%	67%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	55%	52%	60%	54%	52%
Science Achievement				73%	54%	56%	69%	54%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				88%	83%	78%	91%	81%	77%

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					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	73%	52%	21%	54%	19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	66%	48%	18%	52%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
08	2021					
	2019	77%	54%	23%	56%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	76%	57%	19%	55%	21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	85%	57%	28%	54%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2021					
	2019	69%	41%	28%	46%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	73%	45%	28%	48%	25%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	88%	77%	11%	71%	17%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	65%	35%	61%	39%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

To monitor student progress in grades 1 and 2, we are using the results of iReady assessments. In grades 3-8, we are using scores from Quarterly Benchmarks and FSA.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/31%	29/42%	41/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/26%	19/41%	24/58%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/11%	2/25%
	English Language Learners	5/22%	9/41%	11/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16/23%	23/34%	46/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/15%	14/30%	29/64%
	Students With Disabilities	1/10%	1/11%	5/63%
	English Language Learners	3/13%	7/32%	14/64%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25/40%	38/62%	42/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/40%	25/67%	24/67%
	Students With Disabilities	1/13%	3/38%	3/38%
	English Language Learners	3/21%	5/36%	8/57%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19/31%	32/53%	38/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/25%	17/47%	19/61%
	Students With Disabilities	2/25%	1/13%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	2/14%	4/29%	6/43%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46/56%	43/52%	46/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	20/43%	20/41%	20/41%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	3/20%	2/13%
	English Language Learners	19/42%	15/48%	15/48%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	50/60%	53/66%	53/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/45%	24/50%	25/51%
	Students With Disabilities	4/29%	3/21%	3/20%
	English Language Learners	14/45%	28/60%	18/58%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36/62%	34/56%	37/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22/61%	19/50%	22/54%
	Students With Disabilities	1/25%	1/25%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	6/46%	5/36%	9/60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39/66%	36/59%	40/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/62%	20/53%	25/63%
	Students With Disabilities	1/20%	1/25%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	6/46%	8/57%	9/64%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78/54%	90/62%	41/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33/43%	41/53%	21/44%
	Students With Disabilities	6/27%	6/27%	2/13%
	English Language Learners	15/36%	18/43%	10/44%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	98/68%	105/72%	116/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	47/61%	55/71%	49/71%
	Students With Disabilities	9/41%	11/52%	13/57%
	English Language Learners	26/61%	38/67%	29/68%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	69/49%	61/49%	88/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	30/40%	30/39%	39/47%
	Students With Disabilities	7/33%	6/27%	5/22%
	English Language Learners	14/33%	14/33%	17/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	92/63%	107/75%	115/78%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/61%	61/71%	67/77%
	Students With Disabilities	4/33%	5/45%	7/58%
	English Language Learners	5/31%	6/38%	14/82%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	101/71%	127/89%	127/86%
	Economically Disadvantaged	58/71%	76/88%	74/86%
	Students With Disabilities	5/45%	7/64%	7/58%
	English Language Learners	6/38%	14/88%	14/82%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73/54%	91/67%	79/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/32%	9/41%	48/44%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/43%	1/17%
	English Language Learners	7/32%	9/41%	4/18%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48/52%	67/66%	61/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/49%	43/62%	40/56%
	Students With Disabilities	1/14%	4/57%	1/17%
	English Language Learners	8/38%	9/43%	7/32%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	116/88%	114/84%	107/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/84%	70/79%	68/76%
	Students With Disabilities	2/33%	3/43%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	17/77%	14/67%	10/45%

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	96/66%	107/76%	92/66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40/51%	52/75%	42/57%
	Students With Disabilities	4/44%	5/63%	1/20%
	English Language Learners	1/05%	8/42%	2/12%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33/67%	45/65%	115/79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/77%	32/68%	54/70%
	Students With Disabilities	3/27%	4/67%	7/88%
	English Language Learners	7/58%	10/58%	17/71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	74/52%	92/66%	88/62%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/40%	41/55%	34/44%
	Students With Disabilities	3/43%	4/50%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	2/11%	4/21%	1/5%

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	36	34	40	73	80	13				
ELL	48	54	55	66	70	81	29	67	50		
ASN	95	76		86	76						
BLK	53	48	50	60	54	63	48	76	56		
HSP	57	57	56	72	63	70	47	77	61		
MUL	67	40		87	60						
WHT	77	67	33	83	73	75	87	84	81		
FRL	57	56	49	69	62	68	43	76	62		
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	38	65	64	68	67	60					
ELL	40	52	52	61	59	53	33	64	50		

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
ASN	100	79		100	89						
BLK	51	53	46	65	69	65	38	75	70		
HSP	66	62	56	79	68	60	70	85	58		
MUL	93	79		93	87						
WHT	88	72	50	94	83	83	91	96	76		
FRL	62	59	54	74	68	59	60	82	50		

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	52	44	33	64	64	50	45				
ELL	28	59	56	47	41	41		74			
ASN	92	67		100	88		100		100		
BLK	51	49	47	61	63	56	36	84	81		
HSP	70	64	62	73	61	58	63	91	88		
MUL	87	57		81	64						
WHT	87	64	60	91	75	72	89	91	92		
FRL	64	58	57	69	63	58	57	87	84		

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	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	74
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	662
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	63
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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	73
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	62
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?

The trends that have emerged across all grade levels and core content areas is that the subgroups of SWDs and ELLs consistently underperformed when compared to the students in the general education program.

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

Data components related to fluency, reading comprehension, and vocabulary are areas that demonstrated 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?

Our largest contributing factor to this need for improvement is attendance. New actions that we will take include further development of our SEL program, early intervention through the problem solving team, and strategic development of support staff schedules.

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

Science and writing showed the most improvement.

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

Vertical planning supported teachers in providing appropriate scaffolding to meet the needs of all achievement levels. Focused instruction on elaboration and citing evidence in writing helped to increase writing scores.

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

Professional development for teachers and staff geared toward remediation, acceleration and planning with the end in mind. Resources for small group instruction.

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.

Utilizing our reading coach to provide provide professional development. Coaching cycles, observations/feedback, and co-teaching models as needed for teacher support.

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

Monitoring of EWS/academic data, intervention support from school social worker and psychologist, allocation of appropriate resources, and staff professional development.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus will target learning gains of all students, including those in the bottom quartile. Continuous growth in Mathematics achievement of all students will close the gap between proficient and nonproficient mathematicians.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, there will be a 10% increase in learning gains for all students taking the 2021-2022 FSA MA assessment as compared to the learning gains of the previous FSA assessment.

Monitoring: Implementation of frequent progress monitoring will occur by teacher and administration. Small group instruction and differentiated instruction based on data, will be incorporated into weekly lessons. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students and students will monitor their own progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of frequent progress monitoring will occur by teacher and administration. Small group instruction and differentiated instruction based on data, will be incorporated into weekly lessons. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students and students will monitor their own progress. Acaletics and i-Ready will be used to supplement instruction and tiered interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: District Academic Focus outlines the programs and instructional strategies that must be used with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and administrators will review and analyze relevant student data including Fall i-Ready Diagnostic scores, Acaletics Scrimmages, and 20-21 FSA scores.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Using all relevant data, teachers will create small groups for math instruction, identify their target skill for improvement, and develop a progress monitoring plan.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Progress monitoring data will be reviewed monthly by students, teachers, and administrators in order to make needed adjustments to instruction and ensure adequate progress towards the goal is being made.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus will target learning gains of all students, including those in the bottom quartile. Continuous growth in Reading achievement of all students will close the gap between proficient and nonproficient readers.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, there will be a 10% increase in learning gains for all students taking the 2021-2022 FSA ELA assessment as compared to the learning gains of the previous FSA assessment.

Monitoring: Implementation of frequent progress monitoring will occur by teacher and administration. Small group instruction and differentiated instruction based on data, will be incorporated into weekly lessons. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students and students will monitor their own progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of frequent progress monitoring will occur by teacher and administration. Small group instruction and differentiated instruction based on data, will be incorporated into weekly lessons. Teachers will conduct monthly data chats with students and students will monitor their own progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Meta-analysis of instructional strategies, Visual Learning by John Hattie. Teachers at Johnson K-8 plan lessons through the eyes of learners. This strategy supports students to be facilitators of their own learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and administrators will review and analyze relevant student data including Fall i-Ready Diagnostic scores, Reading Plus, and 20-21 FSA scores.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Using all relevant data, teachers will create small groups for reading instruction, identify their target skill for improvement, and develop a progress monitoring plan.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Progress monitoring data will be reviewed monthly by students, teachers, and administrators in order to make needed adjustments to instruction and ensure adequate progress towards the goal is being made.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

This Area of Focus was identified as a critical need by analyzing English Language Arts for students in grades 3-8. Infusing evidence-based writing across the curriculum requires students to focus on ideas, organize sequences, and synthesize concepts. All of these skills are essential to demonstrating proficiency not only on the English Language Arts assessment, but also on the Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies state assessments. Additionally, the International Baccalaureate Programme promotes inquiry across content areas so students can evaluate and synthesize information from multiple perspectives. This cross-content inquiry leads to students engaging in higher order thinking skills. Teachers will use collaborative planning groups to incorporate best practices in Writing instruction throughout the curriculum. Expert teachers who are highly proficient and high impact instructional approaches that improve student writing technique will lead professional development and collaborative groups to build teacher capacity.

Measurable Outcome:

Through the implementation of writing and inquiry across all content areas, we will achieve an A as a combined K-8 school as measured by the state's overall school grade calculation.

Monitoring:

Write Score, Johnson K-8 Mock Writing assessment in second semester. Teachers are encouraged to continue writing prompts throughout weekly lessons following the Focus and Purpose, Evidence and Elaboration, and Conventions. Teachers are trained on the rubric annually.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will implement the IB philosophy in combination with Write Score resources, FSA rubrics and scoring samples to ensure our students are strong writers that are detailed oriented, disciplined, and express ideas clearly with the use of strong vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The IB philosophy and curriculum believes that writing should not be limited to language and literature classes. Writing across content areas allows for the students at Johnson K-8 to be interdisciplinary thinkers. Writing helps our students to reflect on key concepts and new ideas.

Action Steps to Implement

Writing training, to include Write Score resources, FSA rubrics, and worked samples will be provided to all faculty.

Person Responsible

Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Teachers will include writing assignments in lesson plans across the curriculum and assess student work based on the FSA rubrics.

Person Responsible

Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Faculty will engage in vertical planning to ensure the fidelity of writing instruction across all grade levels.

Person Responsible

Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Progress monitoring data, to include scores from rubrics across multiple subject areas and multiple grade levels, will be reviewed monthly by students, teachers, and administrators in order to make needed adjustments to instruction and ensure adequate progress towards the goal is being made.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Referral data from the 2020-2021 school year indicated that our largest behavior infractions were for Defiance and Disrespect.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 2021-2022 school year we will reduce our referrals related to defiance and disrespect by 20% as measured by Focus discipline data.

Monitoring: During ILT monthly data meetings the team will review tier 1 behavior data. The team will work to identify trends in data and make plans for tier 2/3 interventions, as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Through the implementation of PBIS, a multi-tiered model that seeks to support and enhance both academic and behavioral outcomes for all students, teachers and staff will recognize students who are meeting expectations in an effort to reduce undesired behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: At Johnson K-8, we want to recognize all students for meeting expectations. In doing this, students who are not meeting expectations strive to meet expectations to be recognized in a positive way. When a school approaches discipline in a punitive manner, behaviors are only fixed temporarily and the opportunity to recognize those meeting expectations is lost.

Action Steps to Implement

Training will be provided to faculty and staff on Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports and how to effectively implement strategies for recognizing appropriate school behaviors.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

Using Class Dojo, students on campus will earn points for demonstrating behaviors that align to the IB Learner Profile and represent the behaviors that we want to see on campus. Students will have a opportunity to receive rewards based on the points they have earned on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@manateeschools.net)

The Instructional Leadership Team will review discipline data monthly to monitor the progress of our PBIS strategies.

Person Responsible Anthony (Tony) Losada (losadaa@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.

In reviewing the data at SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, Johnson K-8 ranked 255th out of 313 schools in number of suspensions. We will monitor the number of suspensions during our monthly Threat Assessment Team, ILT, and IST meetings. These teams will identify trends and implement school-wide practices that both instruct students on appropriate social interactions as well as classroom behavior that promotes a safe and positive learning environment.

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.

Being an International Baccalaureate School, administration stresses the importance of the IB Learner Profile not only with students, but also with all stakeholders who are involved in supporting our school. Some of the more prominent attributes of the profile include being caring, reflective and communicative. Our administration encourages all stakeholders to demonstrate these attributes in their attitudes and actions. This profile is shown as we involve our stakeholders by serving on the School Advisory Committee, volunteering for Community Service Project evaluations, and participating in the Parent Teacher Organization. Outreach programs include Peace Day celebrations, community fundraisers and service volunteering opportunities.

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

SAC-The SAC committee assists in the preparation and evaluation of the results of the school improvement plan and assists the administrative team with the annual school budget. The SAC committee also approves funding and shares ideas for classroom resources and schoolwide events that promote a positive culture and build strong learning environments for the students at Johnson K-8.

PTO - JK8's PTO gives parents and teachers the opportunity to work together to supplement and enrich the school culture and learning environment at Johnson K-8.

Families - The families at Johnson K-8 make up our largest stakeholder group. Our families reinforce content taught during the school day at home each night through the support of homework. Our families bring our students to extra-curricular events and engage in fellowship with other students, families, and

staff.

Teachers and Staff- The teachers and staff at Johnson K-8 are dedicated to meeting all of the needs for all students. The teachers and staff at Johnson K-8 not only support academic needs, but are also there to make sure all students are successful with their communication, social, and emotional skills.

Students- The students at Johnson K-8 have a huge role in promoting a positive culture and having strong learning environments across the campus. Students strive each day to exhibit the characteristics of the IB Learner Profiles and be productive members of our school community.

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
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00