

Manatee County Public Schools

Florine J Abel Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

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

Demographics

Principal: Samantha Webb

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

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

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;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</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;">74%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We will work together to build a positive culture and provide the best instruction for our Eagles.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Eagles Soaring to Success!

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
Webb, Samantha	Principal	Facilitate SIP Planning, Monitor, Provide Support, Develop Action Plans for Support
Moore, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Facilitate SIP Planning, Monitor, Provide Support, Develop Action Plans for Support

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Samantha Webb

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.*

2

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.*

2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

461

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

2

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

4

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	72	69	71	87	68	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	4	1	1	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	32	25	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	70	77	72	87	59	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	7	9	10	11	9	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
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	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	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				41%	52%	57%	40%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	57%	58%	46%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	55%	53%	38%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				58%	63%	63%	50%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	68%	62%	57%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	53%	51%	38%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	48%	53%	38%	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	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	44%	56%	-12%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	65%	-2%	64%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

- Grades 1/2:
iReady (Fall, Winter, Spring)
- Grade 3:
iReady (Fall, Winter) & FSA (Spring)
- Grades 4/5:
iReady (Fall), Quarter 2 Benchmarks (Winter), FSA (Spring)
- Grade 5 Science:
Quarter 1/2 Benchmarks (Fall, Winter), SSA (Spring)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17.4	32.9	52.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.4	28.8	46.2
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	14.3	21.4
	English Language Learners	18.2	23.1	30.8
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	21.4	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	7.8	23.1	47
	Students With Disabilities	0	14.3	16.7
	English Language Learners	0	7.7	36.4

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14.9	24.3	43.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	14.3	17.6	38
	Students With Disabilities	0	7.7	27.3
	English Language Learners	0	6.7	7.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7.5	30	45.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	23.5	43
	Students With Disabilities	0	23.1	40
	English Language Learners	7.1	6.7	23.1
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22.2	14.6	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.7	13.2	5.3
	Students With Disabilities	8.7	5.3	0
	English Language Learners	17.4	20	13
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	4.9	33	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	6.7	0	26.1
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	17.4
	English Language Learners	0	0	32

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	50	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.2	46	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	23	15
	English Language Learners	5.6	44	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24.5	69	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.6	66	68
	Students With Disabilities	14.3	43	38
	English Language Learners	22.2	57	68.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12.2	23.1	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.2	24.3	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	6.3	15
	English Language Learners	3.7	16.7	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	21.9	68	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	12.5	62	56
	Students With Disabilities	10	50	25
	English Language Learners	22.2	73	56
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	32	43	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	34	35	39
	Students With Disabilities	32	10	20
	English Language Learners	22	30	26
	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	12	35	18	25	57	58	21				
ELL	27	33	33	54	81		28				
BLK	30	50		50	58		42				
HSP	38	36	31	58	76	58	42				
MUL	33			82							
WHT	44	43		61	79		54				
FRL	34	42	39	52	79	74	41				
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	17	59	63	39	86	78	25				
ELL	38	43	53	56	72	45	32				
BLK	34	45	36	46	58						
HSP	39	50	61	57	75	67	25				
MUL	53	50		79	60						
WHT	47	56	50	64	79	62	57				
FRL	36	48	59	54	70	68	36				
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	19	30	35	20	38	38	10				
ELL	29	46	44	42	55	44	12				
BLK	27	39	42	38	66	55	31				
HSP	38	49	42	52	61	42	32				
MUL	47	64		47	55						
WHT	50	41	9	53	47	20	52				
FRL	37	45	41	45	56	37	33				

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	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
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	
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	46
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	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	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	56
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	52
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?

Math proficiency and learning gains are increasing.
 ELA proficiency and learning gains are consistently low.

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

ELA proficiency, learning gains and L25 learning gains.

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

Contributing factors that led to the greatest need for ELA improvement are: low leverage instructional practices being implemented and the need for highly effective teachers to be teaching priority subject areas.

New actions that need to be taken are ensuring that highly effective teachers are teaching ELA in grades 3-5 and that professional development occurs across the year with a focus on high effect size instructional strategies.

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

Math proficiency and math learning gains.

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

Implementation of Acaletics-supplemental math program.

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

ELA: Implementation of an additional 1 hour reading block with a focus on small group researched based interventions. Implementation of researched based instructional practices.

Math: continue with Acaletics outside of math block and implement spiral review during core math block

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional Development Opportunities that will be provided to support teachers/leaders are micro PD sessions for: Teaching with Clarity (Success Criteria), Thinking Maps & Writing in Response, and Differentiation.

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

Additional services will include after school collaborative planning with a focus on instructional practices, additional PD opportunities, and school based coaching cycles.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA data shows a trend of low proficiency and learning gains. There is a significant gap with our ELA scores compared to our Math scores. Instructional Practices for ELA will include: Additional 1 hour reading block with a focus on RTI and small group interventions, Teaching with Clarity, Thinking Maps and Daily Writing in Response to Thinking Maps, and Daily Standards Based Text Dependent Questions.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, we would like to increase our overall ELA proficiency score by 5% and learning gains/lowest quartile gains to increase to 65%, as measured by the FSA.

Monitoring: Administration will collaborate with grade levels during after school collaborative planning. Administration will provide weekly walk throughs for ELA blocks-supporting teachers with specific feedback and coaching cycle opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: RTI groups & Teaching with Clarity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Response to intervention has an effect size of 1.29 and Teaching with Clarity has an effect size of 0.75 (Hattie 2018).

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation and monitoring of Abel University (a one-hour extended reading block focused on providing tiered interventions)
 Weekly focused classroom walk throughs with immediate feedback to teachers based on teaching with clarity, text dependent questions, Thinking Maps writing in response, and differentiation
 Collaboration with grade level teachers during standards based planning

Person Responsible Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: School Wide Referrals were consistent with the year prior-over 200 referrals. Range of referrals varied from 1-11 referrals per student. Our school did not have tier 1 expectations for behaviors.

Measurable Outcome: By June 1st, 2022, discipline referrals will decrease by 10%.

Monitoring: Our PBIS team will meet twice per month to analyze data and develop action plans for Tier 1 and Tier 2/3 intervention groups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implementation of PBIS Tier 1 expectations, SEL Lessons, procedures, etc. and Tier 2/3 interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on John Hattie's research, Behavioral Intervention Programs have a positive effect size of 0.62, along with positive peer influences 0.53, strong classroom cohesion 0.44 and teacher student relationships at 0.52. All of these practices are directly tied to implementing a solid PBIS structure at our school.

Action Steps to Implement

- School wide expectation posters for all classrooms, hallways and common areas.
- School wide pledge recited daily via morning announcements.
- Celebrating student success with expectations and pledge.
- Facilitating PBIS biweekly meetings to analyze behavioral data & look at students in need of possible tiered behavioral interventions

Person Responsible: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Professional Learning Communities has been identified as a critical need based on the trend of low reading proficiency and learning gains across grades K-5. Instructional practices have been established across the school, including: Teaching with Clarity, Thinking Maps Writing in Response, Differentiation, and Text Dependent Questions. Teachers need frequent opportunities to receive professional development in the areas, provide feedback on practices, have reoccurring discussions analyzing standards based formative and summative assessment data, and develop action plans based on data to implement to increase student reading achievement.

Measurable Outcome: By June 2022, we would like to increase grade level learning gains for ELA by 10%, as measured by the iReady Reading Spring Diagnostic (K-2) and FSA-ELA (3-5).

Monitoring: PLCs will be monitored by providing teachers with frequent feedback based on instructional practices and actions plans developed during PLCs. Additionally, they will be monitored by ongoing data analysis for grade level reading assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Micro-Teaching/Video Review of Lessons Feedback

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Micro-Teaching/Video Review of Lessons - 0.88 Effect Size (Hattie, 2018)
Feedback - 0.70 Effect Size (Hattie, 2018)

Action Steps to Implement

Develop PLC schedule with Instructional Leadership Team focusing on instructional practices specifically targeting ELA & ongoing data analysis.
Provide teachers with micro-teaching videos of exemplar model of instructional practice.
Provide teachers with biweekly feedback on PLC instructional practices

Person Responsible Samantha Webb (webbs@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.

We will monitor office discipline referrals for violent offenses, especially aggressive or physically aggressive behaviors. School culture and environment will be monitored by our PBIS team. The team will implement and analyze the effects of our Tier 1 PBIS expectations, procedures, 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.

- Implementation of PBIS school wide expectations, school pledge and school song-all voted on by students, staff and families.
- Daily positive morning announcements that begin with our school song, review school wide expectations, celebrate daily student successes and end with our school pledge.
- Monthly newsletters to families that celebrate students learning in the classrooms.
- Bimonthly School Wide Spirit Weeks-with student votes for activities.

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

- Administration, leadership team and PBIS team-role is to develop scope and sequence for a purposeful positive culture and environment, including student and staff celebrations, core values, student and staff input, etc.
- Students-provide input on activities and celebration, model school wide expectations
- Families-work with children and school to problem solve
- Community and Business Partnerships-support school with student celebrations, provide assistance to families in need of essential living items.

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00