

Manatee County Public Schools

# Ida M. Stewart Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Ida M. Stewart Elementary School

7905 15TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

### Demographics

**Principal: Joe Hougland**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	35%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: B (55%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>22</b>

## Ida M. Stewart Elementary School

7905 15TH AVE NW, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

### School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	21%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

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

### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Stewart Elementary School is to stimulate students to become self-motivated, life-long learners by providing appropriate educational experience through the involvement of staff, parents, and community.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a safe and stimulating environment where students are trustworthy and take learning seriously to reach their highest academic, social and emotional potential. Students will meet these high expectations while learning how to be respectful and responsible citizens so they can make their best contribution to 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
Hougland, Joseph	Principal	Principal of Stewart Elementary
Heathcote, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Stewart Elementary
Powell, Kelly	Administrative Support	Student Support Specialist
Drao, Heather	Teacher, ESE	Inclusion Teacher
Cobb, Mary	Teacher, K-12	1st Grade
Butler, Brenda	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade
Bosner, Heather	Teacher, K-12	4th Grade
Schultz, Kim	Teacher, K-12	2nd Grade
Savchuk, Michelle	School Counselor	Counseling, Testing coordinator

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Joe Hougland

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

3

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

3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

32

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

394

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

5

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

3

### Demographic Data

## Early Warning Systems

### 2021-22

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	58	65	53	72	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	365
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	4	6	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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**

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	64	70	49	77	53	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	8	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	64	70	49	77	53	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368
Attendance below 90 percent	1	4	8	7	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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				76%	52%	57%	74%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				67%	57%	58%	65%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	55%	53%	52%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				76%	63%	63%	77%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				77%	68%	62%	71%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	53%	51%	50%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	48%	53%	64%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	56%	30%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	52%	15%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	60%	10%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	65%	12%	64%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	60%	10%	60%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

1. iReady was utilized for Grades 1-2 ELA and Math, Fall, Winter, and Spring
3. FSA was utilized for Grades 3,4 and 5 for Spring ELA, Math and Science.
4. District Benchmarks were utilized for Grade 3,4 and 6 Fall and Winter ELA, Math and Science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/28%	69/65%	70/81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/25%	13/62%	13/69%
	Students With Disabilities	10/30%	10/50%	10/90%
	English Language Learners	0	1/100%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	67/34%	70/73%	70/88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/33%	13/54%	10/77%
	Students With Disabilities	10/30%	10/60%	10/90%
	English Language Learners	0	0	1/100%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50/46%	51/75%	51/88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/50%	16/81%	16/88%
	Students With Disabilities	7/29%	7/57%	7/86%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/100%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49/25%	51/55%	51/82%
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/33%	16/44%	12/75%
	Students With Disabilities	6/33%	7/43%	7/43%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/100%	1/100%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44/75%	72/78%	72/75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/73%	18/61%	18/56%
	Students With Disabilities	6/50%	18/67%	18/50%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	72/75%	43/84%	70/73%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/56%	14/79%	18/50%
	Students With Disabilities	18/83%	7/71%	15/73%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	0	2/0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	69/86%	51/75%	50/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/83%	15/60%	16/56%
	Students With Disabilities	15/87%	13/23%	13/30%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	56/68%	51/78%	69/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17/59%	16/56%	9/50%
	Students With Disabilities	14/29%	12/50%	11/73%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	4/25%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/71%	55/67%	50/64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/44%	18/50%	13/31%
	Students With Disabilities	9/11%	9/11%	7/14%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/70%	55/82%	48/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/50%	18/61%	13/69%
	Students With Disabilities	9/22%	9/33%	13/39%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/55%	55/71%	51/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/33%	18/56%	14/36%
	Students With Disabilities	9/44%	9/33%	7/14%
	English Language Learners	3/33%	3/0%	3/0%

### 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	36	60		59	70		20				
HSP	47			53							
WHT	77	74		82	87		79				
FRL	52	61		57	74		39				
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	55	56	57	53	63	50	31				
ELL	32	50		37	55						
HSP	50	69	64	48	67	44	40				
WHT	84	65	69	85	80	31	57				
FRL	53	60	65	58	63	35	35				

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	48	57	53	52	53	29	33				
HSP	63	68		57	57		46				
WHT	77	64	50	83	74	53	70				
FRL	52	55	40	60	64	39	50				

### 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	71
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	494
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	80
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	57
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?**

Data from 20-21 was utilized in this section, as that is what will help us improve academics during the 21-22 school year.

Reading:

iReady Assessments K-5 in reading show 85% of our students are on or above grade level in reading as compared to the district average of 58%. FSA ELA indicates 73% of grades 3-5 are on or above grade level. L25 Reading scores remained at 69% during the 20-21 school year. Our goal for the 21-22 school year is to attain a 78% proficiency in Reading.

Math:

iReady Assessments K-5 in math show 84% of our students are on or above grade level as compared to the district average of 60%. FSA Math indicates 79% of grades 3-5 students are on or above grade level. L25 Math scores moved from 53% to 62% during the 20-21 school year, and this will remain a strong focus. Our goal for the 21-22 school year is to maintain or exceed the 79% proficiency in Math.

Science:

FSA Science Assessments shows 65% of our 5th grade met proficiency. Our goal for 21-22 school year is for our 5th graders to be 75% proficient.

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

In 2019, just 41% of our L-25 Math students made gains as compared to 2018 of 50%. We did not have our typical curriculum to address the Florida Math Standards. We anticipate that performance will be 50% or higher this year. Our progress monitoring from the 20-21 school year shows that we will need to provide additional support to our 14 5th graders with disabilities. Our goal will be for 60% or more of these students to be proficient in both ELA and Math.

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

As stated above, in 2019, just 41% of our L25 math students made gains. This was below BOTH the state and County average. The gap year in curriculum material appears to have impacted student performance. This indicated a need for teacher training in Math standards. Our interventions resulted in these students attaining a proficiency rate of 62% on the Spring Math FSA. We want to maintain / exceed at least 62% proficiency of our L25 Math students.

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

Our ELA L25 growth improved from 52% in 2018 to 69% in 2019 - and we maintained this growth on 21 FSA results. This is a testament to our hard work with strategic, small group instruction during WIN time. This is only going to improve with our experience. Teachers are working hard to create a pathway to success for all T2/T3 students.

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

Our Science achievement went from 64% in 2018 to 53% in 2019. In 2021 we reached 65% proficiency. Our achievement was impacted with our goals of addressing the vocabulary behind science, our STEM teacher's support, and not departmentalizing our 5th grade. We will monitor student understanding via Study Island.

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



1. Math L25 - we will continue to focus on our T2 / T3 Math students via interventions in iReady.
2. Science - Science instruction will include language and vocabulary of Science, Science passages utilized in the ELA block and enhanced authentic investigations of Physical and Natural Science. We will monitor student understanding via Study Island.
3. NOTE: ELL Subgroup removed due to redistricting in the school district. We currently have 6 ELL students remaining at Stewart.

**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.**

We will plan strategically to support and challenge our students with effective and efficient programming. Teachers will be given an additional day of team planning each semester.

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

To maintain our achievement levels academically, we must ensure support is also given socially and emotionally, especially during the frequent disruptions and stress of our school community due to COVID. This will occur through our emphasis on a healthy, welcoming and safe school community, and our Character Strong program.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	We will continue to focus on our L25 Math students because just 41% made gains during testing in 2019. Last year's Q2 benchmark showed 61% made gains.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	If we focus on effective differentiation and scaffolding of standards, then at least 69% of our L25 Math students will show growth by May 2022, as evidenced by FSA Scores.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The GAP eliminator will assist us in effectively and efficiently scaffold content for each learner. We will utilize IXL, I Ready Standards Mastery, District Benchmarks, Acaletics and Reflex Math to monitor progress.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The GAP eliminator will assist us in effectively and efficiently scaffolding content for each learner. We will utilize the strategy of small group tutoring via IXL, Acaletics and Reflex Math to monitor progress.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The GAP eliminator will assist us in effectively and efficiently scaffolding content for each learner. We will utilize IXL, Acaletics and Reflex Math to monitor progress.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. We know our goal is to show 69% or more of our L-25 Math students to show growth on the FSA.
2. We will analyze data and create an action plan using our GAP analysis.
3. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats to review data, and determine how assessment of all data (T 1,2 and 3) informs instruction.
4. We will utilize small group tutoring to address needs during our (WIN) time. We will be utilizing IXL, Acaletics data and Reflex math.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

<b>Area of Focus</b>	
<b>Description and Rationale:</b>	If we implement a K-5 Science plan to include an emphasis on Power Standards along with interactive science notebooks (writing to raise achievement), then proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 Science will increase from 53% to 70% as measured in the 2020-2021 school year.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	If we implement a K-5 Science plan to include an emphasis on Power Standards along with interactive science notebooks (writing to raise achievement), then proficiency on the FCAT 2.0 Science will increase from 53% to 70% or more as measured in the 2020-2021 school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	We will utilize Study Island Science and HMH standards-based assessments and district benchmarks to monitor student progress. We will utilize GAP (Goal, Analysis, Plan) eliminator to effectively differentiate and scaffold standards and fill the gaps of learning for our students.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Joseph Hougland (houglandj@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will utilize Study Island Science and HMH standards-based assessments and district benchmarks to monitor student progress. We will utilize GAP (Goal, Analysis, Plan) eliminator to effectively differentiate and scaffold standards and fill the gaps of learning for our students.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will utilize the GAP (Goal, Analysis, Plan) eliminator to effectively differentiate and scaffold standards and fill the gaps of learning for our Science students. We will utilize Study Island Science, HMH assessments and District Benchmarks and Interactive ELA/ Science notebooks to monitor student progress. We will utilize small group tutoring as a strategy to address needs of students according to their need.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. We know our goal is to be 70% or more proficient in Science.
2. We will analyze data from initial Science assessments and create an action plan.
3. Strategic resources will be selected and aligned to student needs.
4. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats to review data, and determine how assessment of all Science data (T 1,2 and 3) informs instruction.
5. Interactive Science / ELA notebooks will be utilized.
5. We will offer remediation to those students who could benefit.

**Person Responsible** Joseph Hougland (houglandj@manateeschools.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	We will continue to focus on meeting the needs of our T2 and T3 ELA students via interventions in IReady and SIPPS. The 2021 FSA indicated that our L25 ELA students were 69% proficient. We will focus on effective differentiation and scaffolding of standards.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	If we focus on effective differentiation and scaffolding of standards, then at least 75% of our L25 ELA students will show gains by May, 2022.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	The GAP eliminator will assist us in effectively and efficiently scaffolding the content for each learner. We will utilize I Ready, SIPPS, & District Benchmarks to monitor progress.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@manateeschools.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	We will utilize small group tutoring utilizing, SIPPS, iReady Toolbox, and interactive ELA notebooks.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	The GAP eliminator will assist us in effectively and efficiently scaffolding content for each learner. We will utilize I Ready, SIPPS, District Benchmarks and Interactive notebooks to monitor progress.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. We know our goal is for 75% or more of our L-25 ELA students show gains.
2. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats to review data and student progress toward our goal of 75% L25 ELA students being proficient.
3. We will create an action plan for each learner.
4. Teachers will tutor small groups during WIN time Strategic resources (I Ready, SIPPS) will be selected and aligned to student needs.

**Person Responsible** Lisa Heathcote (heathcotel@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.

**Stewart Elementary was not listed in the report. We work diligently to protect the teaching and learning environment. When a student makes a mistake, we work with that student and the family in a restorative fashion. We keep a log of every discipline issue that occurs, and provide additional support with School Counselor, IST process, etc.**

## 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.

#### School Updates

- PTO Facebook Page
- Stewart Website
- Stewart Facebook Page
- Teacher individual newsletters/Schoology
- Email and Connect Ed phone calls
- Family Fun Nights such as, Father Daughter Dance, Boo-Hoo breakfast, Fall Festival, etc.)
- Parent/Student fundraisers
- Silent Auction
- SAC
- Back To School Night Open House
- Report Card Conference Nights
- Science Fair and Music Performance Night
- Stewart Star Assemblies quarterly
- PTO keeping membership at a reasonable cost
- Family Fun Nights (aka - skate night, dinner at Sweetberries, etc)
- Our SEL program (Character Strong) will be utilize to support our goals

NOTE: Many activities are paused for now due to COVID.

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

The entire Stewart community is participating in promoting a positive culture and environment.

Students - We are here for them - to help them reach their fullest potential - socially, emotionally and academically.

Staff - We are dedicated to the art and science of teaching and learning.

SAC - The SAC is dedicated to fulfilling the goals of the SIP and supporting the needs of the school.

PTO - The PTO is dedicated to fulfilling a warm and welcoming school environment, in which all are welcome.

Our collective SEL Goals this year include:

- 1) Teachers will create positive family and community relationship.
- 2) Students will develop a sense of empathy and cultivate a caring community of caring.

3) Stewart Star Awards criteria for 2021-22 will tie in with SEL vision and goals.

## 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: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00