
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Robert Willis Elementary School

14705 THE MASTERS AVE, Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathy Price

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	23%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (74%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (70%)
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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Robert Willis Elementary School

14705 THE MASTERS AVE, Lakewood Ranch, FL 34202

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">18%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">27%</p>

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 Robert E. Willis Elementary School is a commitment to excellence in all aspects of our school and culture.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Vision of Robert E. Willis Elementary School is to promote and foster student achievement by providing an academically enriching environment that nurtures and supports the whole child.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Price, Katherine	Principal	Assist the SIP and ILT team as instructional leader in determining and providing personnel, resources, training and intervention to achieve our data based SIP goals.
Mau, Rhonda	Assistant Principal	Assist the SIP team as chair and ILT team in determining and providing resources, training and intervention to achieve our data based SIP goals.
Morales, Phyllis	School Counselor	Assist the SIP and ILT team in determining and providing resources, training and intervention to achieve our data based SIP goals.
Van Zytveld, Sarah	School Counselor	Assist the SIP and ILT team in determining and providing resources, training and intervention to achieve our data based SIP goals.
Thomas, Kimberly	Administrative Support	Assist the SIP and ILT team in determining and providing resources, training and intervention to achieve our data based SIP goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 8/25/2021, Kathy Price

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.*

6

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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

777

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	120	135	113	122	134	135	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	88	87	88	85	81	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	514
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	15	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Wednesday 8/25/2021

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	100	102	109	110	126	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
Attendance below 90 percent	99	102	109	110	126	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
One or more suspensions	0	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	100	102	109	110	126	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
Attendance below 90 percent	99	102	109	110	126	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	661
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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				83%	52%	57%	85%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				68%	57%	58%	71%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				73%	55%	53%	60%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				83%	63%	63%	82%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				79%	68%	62%	69%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	49%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				76%	48%	53%	75%	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	76%	51%	25%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	56%	30%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	85%	52%	33%	56%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	60%	22%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	86%	65%	21%	64%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	60%	20%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	75%	48%	27%	53%	22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We feel that due to Covid 19, not all assessments were valid or given since the first one of the year was not mandatory and could be taken at home.

Willis elementary school used iReady diagnostics for progress monitoring data in the Winter and Spring for all grade levels, but this diagnostic does not provide demographic information for our purposes here. School City provides the data from Manatee District Benchmark assessment reports with demographics for 3rd-5th in quarters 1 and 2. Quarter 1 data is listed under Fall and quarter 2 is listed under Winter.

Then, Spring for 3rd - 5th is the number of students showing proficiency with the 2020-2021 FSA.

For Second grade, we use Literacy Footprints running records because it contains demographic information and the last- Spring diagnostic is District benchmark Assessment.

First grade has two Literacy Footprint running record scores that contain demographic results.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	45	48.6	77.8
	Economically Disadvantaged		25	61.5
	Students With Disabilities		0	28.6
	English Language Learners		14.3	62.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	36	66	85
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67.3	74.1	69.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	60.9	52.2	54.2
	Students With Disabilities	15.4	33.3	30.8
	English Language Learners	0	20	40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	41	67	80
	Economically Disadvantaged			75
	Students With Disabilities			61.5
	English Language Learners			40

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68.1	73	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	49.1	46.7	42.1
	Students With Disabilities	31.3	31.6	55.2
	English Language Learners	42.9	50	55.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71.2	78.3	83.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.8	51.7	62.1
	Students With Disabilities	31.6	42.1	47.4
	English Language Learners	55.6	50	55.6
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67.5	73	78
	Economically Disadvantaged	54.4	50	66.7
	Students With Disabilities	23.1	23.1	26.7
	English Language Learners	46.2	50	66.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	74.2	78.2	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	57.1	57.9	68.2
	Students With Disabilities	23.1	16.7	26.7
	English Language Learners	61.5	63.6	61.5

Grade 5					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		71.7	77.1	79
	Economically Disadvantaged		62.5	68.8	76.9
	Students With Disabilities		36.4	41.7	18.2
	English Language Learners		50	50	57.1
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		70.8	83.2	88
	Economically Disadvantaged		50	80	84.6
	Students With Disabilities		50	41.7	54.5
	English Language Learners		33.3	66.7	85.7
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		58.7	59.6	73.4
	Economically Disadvantaged		33.3	56.3	69.2
	Students With Disabilities		50	33.3	18.2
	English Language Learners		50	66.7	57.1
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	33	36		43	73		25				
ELL	77			70							
ASN	100			100							
HSP	76	55		68	91		67				
MUL	92			83							
WHT	80	72	53	87	84	68	75				
FRL	71	62		71	92		73				
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	52	68	71	46	59	41	60				
ELL	71	80		65	64						
ASN	73			73							

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	85	66		81	76	54	67				
MUL	87	80		83	80		70				
WHT	84	69	72	84	79	62	78				
FRL	71	60	58	70	74	57	60				
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	42	40	52	52	31	38				
ELL	67			67							
ASN	94	82		94	91						
HSP	86	66		81	64	71	71				
MUL	86	87		82	80						
WHT	85	71	60	82	68	44	74				
FRL	75	62	40	71	61	36	52				

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	75
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	87
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	603
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	78
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	100
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	
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	71
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	88
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	76
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	75
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?

In ELA, Willis saw a 3% drop in proficiency from 2019 to 2020. We saw a downward trend in our lowest quartile learning gains in Reading from 2019 FSA scores for 4th and 5th grades to 2020 FSA scores for the same grades. Our 2019 lowest quartile learning gains were at 69%. For 2020, our lowest quartile learning gains went down to 52%.

ELA learning gains is that our Hispanic subgroup dropped from 58% to 55%, it showed a higher learning gain compared to our overall lowest quartile learning gains of 52%. Our SWD group learning gains continues to be lower at 36% for 2020-2021.

In Math, Willis saw just a 1% loss in proficiency overall, but an 8% gain in the 5th grade compared to the 2019 proficiency. 3rd grade was stable with proficiency at 82% for the two years. Math learning gains were greatly improved over the 2019 score of 71% with the 2020 score of 86% overall. The 2020 score of 70% for our lowest quartile learners was a great increase over our 2019 score of 41%. Science scores for 2020 of 74% which is a decrease of 2% over the previous year's scores.

1st and 2nd grades we see very low proficiency with our SWD. Many students are first identified as SWD in these grades as support and tiers are brought in. As the year progresses, so does the proficiency of this group. As they move up through the intermediate grades their proficiency also improves.

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

Looking at our 2020 FSA data of testing for 3rd - 5th grades, we see our lowest areas of reading as Integration of Knowledge and ideas in fourth grade, and Key Ideas and Details in fifth grade. If these areas continue to stand out in our initial diagnostics, they will be the areas that we will focus on. The strategies and resources we use will be chosen to work on these areas. For K-2 we see phonics, using our iReady diagnostic, as the area that needs intervention to move our lowest students forward. Our

In Science our greatest need is in the area of Earth and Space Science which was at 74% and the Nature of Science at 75% in 2020, with the other two categories were at 83% and 78% percentage of possible points.

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

One of the factors that contributed to this data is the fact that many of our lowest quartile students were home for virtual learning for at least the first half of the 2020 school year. It is much more difficult to provide solid intervention in different learning modes through virtual learning.

Also, on campus learning was distanced with minimal small group instruction and no grade level sharing of students to group students with like learning needs. All students and staff wore masks

which can make hearing and understanding more difficult.

We have purchased personal speakers for the teachers to wear with a speaker that is worn around the waist. These make hearing and understanding much easier for those teachers who wear masks and/or shields. Our student are all on campus this year.

Desk barriers are utilized to carry on with small group instruction.

For K-1 we will progress monitor iReady diagnostic data to determine whether students are advancing in the area of phonics as mentioned in section b. Our District Benchmark Assessment will guide us in how our 2 - 5th graders are progressing in quarters 2 - 4.

New Actions: To help our SWD make learning gains, Willis Elementary has changed our ESE resource personnel and our teachers of our two self-contained units. This team is utilizing SIPPS, SRA, Literacy Footprints and all of the district resources that are for all classrooms.

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

Our Math lowest quartile learning gains were increased by 29% in 2020 over the 2019 lowest quartile gains on the FSA state assessment. Our overall learning gains increased 15% from 71% in 2019 to 86% in 2020.

In 5th grade, the greatest improvements were in the areas of integration of knowledge and ideas(+11%), but this is still the lowest percentage for a component overall (74%).

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

Our Fifth and fourth grades implemented ACALETICS math program for the first time in 2020. This program allows us to push certain students in with our top math teachers to move large groups of students who are Third grade started the program in January of 2020. We also started using a new math text resource: EnVision Math. These are contributing factors to the improvements in Math.

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

There is no one fits all strategy for all student groups, so depending on what the data shows are the student's specific weak areas in ELA and Science, we will choose the strategy and programs that fits that need. All remediation will be provided with small group instruction, check in and progress monitoring. We will follow our state approved Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree guidelines.

Our admin team will continue to conduct quarterly data meetings with grade level teams where we evaluate how the current strategy and resource is working for each child and change strategies for those who are not making progress.

We will also utilize some of the following programs: SIPPS, SRA, iReady tools for instruction, LLI, Benchmark Advance differentiated Tier 2 lessons, Literacy footprints with K-2, Imagine Learning with our ELL students, Wonders differentiated Tier 2 lessons with 3rd - 5th.

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 need to provide SIPPS training to our new teachers. Benchmark advance differentiated lesson training to K-2. All of the other programs have been rolled out with training for our teachers. Literacy footprint training is offered on our district professional development site for teachers as needed.

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

Our data meetings that are conducted when we have a new diagnostic or assessment will keep our team on top of any situations where students are not progressing as expected. These are an integral part of our overall plan for meeting students learning needs. Overseeing that teacher progress monitoring is taking place with fidelity.

The use of evidence based programs, materials and strategies will help ensure

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

For the 2021-2022 school year, Willis Elementary School will focus on increasing the percentage of students making learning gains on the ELA FSA for both schoolwide and lowest quartile learning gains.

Comparing our overall learning gains to the previous year, we increased 2 percentage points, but our lowest quartile learning gains decrease from 69% to 52%. We want to regain the lost ground over the Pandemic years.

We feel part of this loss is due to online learning with the lowest quartile students. District and school testing was also complicated and not as reliable during pandemic learning.

Looking at our 2020 FSA data of testing, we see our lowest areas of reading as Integration of Knowledge and ideas in fourth grade, and Key Ideas and Details in fifth grade. If these areas continue to stand out in our initial diagnostics, they will be the areas that we will focus on. The strategies and resources we use will be chosen to work on these areas.

Measurable Outcome:

Willis Elementary School has an ELA goal is to increase the percentage of our lowest quartile who are making learning gains from 52% to 60% as shown by the ELA FSA.

Monitoring:

After our initial iReady diagnostic, our admin and MTSS team will meet with each teacher to look at the data along with our Assessment-Curriculum Decision Tree to place the appropriate students in Tier 2 or/and Tier 3.

As other assessments are taken, we will utilize/triangulate the data to determine greatest needs and progress monitor using district approved learning and monitoring tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rhonda Mau (maur@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The strategies used will be determined by the need and the grade level as outlined in our Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree. Tools utilized will be: Literacy Footprints, SIPPS, i-Ready Tools for Instruction, Imagine Learning for ELLs, LLI and SRA-Corrective Reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Willis staff will use the cycle of data analysis then tailor instruction to meet the students biggest deficit, then monitor with assessments and revisit data to look at additional areas of need when progress is achieved.

The resources listed under Evidence based strategies are tailored to target specific parts of reading along with progress monitoring that is chosen for the specific deficit. Progress monitoring can be done with a component of Dibels that corresponds with the learning need area (Letter-Name Fluency, Phonemic Segmentation fluency, Nonsense word fluency, word reading fluency and oral reading fluency).

Action Steps to Implement

- 1 Administer the iReady diagnostic and STAR reading diagnostic, along with FLKR and Footprints running records.
2. Analyze the data to determine students' needs and strengths.
3. Hone down to classes and have each teacher identify their lowest quartile of learners.
4. Teachers and the admin team meet to look at all the data and determine who needs to start or continue RTI Tiered intervention.
5. Group students based on lowest area of reading needs and use district recommended tools for instruction from the Decision Tree.
6. Form groups for Tier 3 that will meet with a reading endorsed teacher.
7. Progress monitor using 3 yearly iReady diagnostics in K-2 and both iReady and District Benchmark Assessments in 2-5.
8. Repeat steps 1 - 6 adding Quarterly Benchmark Assessment. Instructional Leadership Team will bring team data to determine if gains are being made or if a change of strategies is needed.

Person Responsible Katherine Price (pricek@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our 5th grade Science proficiency has dropped from 76% to 74% on the 2020-2021 FSA. This is a 2% decrease from the 2018-2019 scores. The area that had the lowest proficiency score is the Earth and Space Science category score of 74%.

Measurable Outcome: Willis Elementary School will increase our FSA Science proficiency score from 74% to 76% for 2021-2022.

Monitoring: Willis ES will use the District Benchmark assessment data to analyze growth in Science overall and each Category. Classroom assessments will also be utilized to determine student learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Katherine Price (pricek@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Willis ES will utilize Acaletics Science to help our 5th grade students. Other resources for our 5th grade teachers is the new Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Science Text and their Science Vaults, created by our district Science curriculum coordinator.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Acaletics has a proven record in math in our district and school. They author/creator has created the same concept of resource for Science. This can be a research piece for us to use with some of our classes along with a control class. The new science text is more in-depth than our previous National Geographic text, so depth of knowledge should also increase for students. The district Science Vaults offer many best practice lessons and activities for teachers to choose from.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administer the Science inventory assessment to determine student knowledge and understanding of the Earth and Space Science category.
2. Level/group students by score level.
3. Use the Science Acaletics Club format and WOZ science kits for 4th and 5th grades, to provide teaching beyond the standard curriculum through groups.
4. Keep our STEM teacher inform of the data from FSA, Science Benchmark assessments and teacher used inventories (like Kaplan science inventory) that help
5. Administer Science Benchmark assessments to progress monitor and determine standards to review and/or reteach.
- 6 Revisit student groups who show a deficit in specific areas to regroup as needed.

Person Responsible Rhonda Mau (maur@manateeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Willis Elementary School is in it's second year of implementation of our social-emotional, behavioral goals using Character Strong's implementation structure, character trait lessons, and blending it with our Tiered behavior (PBIS) plan. I will reiterate some of the same strategies that we use here in our discipline plan focus section that follows.
 2020-2021 Willis staff implemented at new SEL character Education plan called "PurposeFull People" by Character Strong. We also received a second guidance counselor who pushed into classes to provide character Education learning. We instituted Student Shout Outs that put the spotlight on exemplary behaviors on our school news. We give quarterly awards to students who exemplify the character traits.

Measurable Outcome: Willis Elementary School has the goal of building positive character traits in our students. Our SEL goal this year is to increase the percentage of students who feel safe about coming to an adult with a problem from 61% on the student survey to 70%.
 This year, which is implementation year two, another goal is the add pilot classrooms using the Character Strong program.

Monitoring: Students do three SEL survey's a year to gauge their perceptions and feelings about safety. Our data that will help us determine improvement is the student survey about their perceptions about school safety. One data area we will monitor is our last survey showed 78% of students feel safe at school. 70% report they are not bullied. 18% say they are slightly bullied, and 3% say they are likely bullied.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Sarah Van Zytveld (vanzytvs@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Character Strong- PurposeFull People
 Tiers Behavior PBIS plan
 We are using counseling practices that are proven to help students cope, become empowered, and feel a sense of safety and support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: K-Kids or student senate give students voice, actions they can take to improve aspects of community.
 Other interventions are counseling practices carried out by social workers and guidance counselors.

Action Steps to Implement

K-Kids service projects that encourage school-wide involvement.
 Book Buddies
 Anti-bullying lessons for 3rd - 5th grade by Character Strong curriculum
 Behavior interventions and plans
 Character Education Specials rotation
 Behavior or emotional support groups

Person Responsible Sarah Van Zytveld (vanzytvs@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.

It is difficult to use the data from the last two years since part of each year was conducted with all or some of the student in the virtual learning mode. The area that we see as our primary area of concern is Aggression. This is physical aggression against themselves, another student or in general with objects in the room. The second area of concern is inappropriate behavior. This can incorporate many behaviors such as cursing, discussions of things not appropriate for public, meanness, not following classroom or school rules, and many more.

For the four years of data of school aggression, the the number of discipline referrals for aggression is on a steady increase until 2020-2021, then there is a sharp decrease probably attributed to learning during the pandemic. Incidences: 2017-18: 58; 2018-19: 84; 2019-20: 111; 2020-2021:53.

2020-2021 Willis staff implemented a new SEL character Education plan called "PurposeFull People" by Character Strong. We also received a second guidance counselor who pushed into classes to provide character Education learning. We instituted Student Shout Outs that put the spotlight on exemplary behaviors on our school news. We give quarterly awards to students who exemplify the character traits. Students do three SEL survey's a year to gauge their perceptions and feelings.

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.

Willis Elementary School is in its second year of implementation of our social-emotional, behavioral goals using Character Strong's implementation structure, character trait lessons, and blending it with our Tiered behavior (PBIS) plan. I will reiterate some of the same strategies that we use here in our discipline plan focus section that follows.

For 2021-2022 we are utilizing Character Strong- PurposeFull People in tandem with our Tiers Behavior PBIS plan. One of our school counselors is part of our Fine Arts rotation so that she can utilize Character Strong's great lessons with K-3. Our second school counselor pushes into 4th and 5th grade classrooms to do lessons with the students.

We are using counseling practices that are proven to help students cope, become empowered, and feel a sense of safety and support.

Willis also promotes and discusses each of the monthly character traits on our school news and relates them to our GECKO attributes that are part of our positive behavior plan.

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

One of our school counselors, Sarah VanZyvtveld, is part of our Fine Arts rotation so that she can utilize Character Strong's great lessons with K-3. Our second school counselor, Phyllis Morales, pushes into 4th and 5th grade classrooms to do lessons with the students.

The Admin team (Mrs. Price and Mrs. Mau) presents each monthly trait on the news along with reading student Shout Outs for students who are recognized for exhibiting these traits.

Our gifted education teacher, Hanna Cuervo, highlights students on the news and character quotes on a daily basis.

All of our classroom teachers follow the School-wide behavior plan to develop, teacher, display and reinforce procedures and behavior management rules that help provide an environment conducive to safe and productive learning.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00