

Manatee County Public Schools

William H. Bashaw Elementary



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

William H. Bashaw Elementary

3515 57TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

Demographics

Principal: James Dougherty

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	75%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (46%)
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

William H. Bashaw Elementary

3515 57TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

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	59%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

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 Bashaw Elementary School is to cultivate distinct pathways for all students to succeed. Through a STEAM model of instruction, we inspire learning with inquiry investigation, collaboration, critical thinking, creativity and authentic experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Bashaw Elementary School is to foster each child's innate curiosity and joy of discovery, empowering them to be leaders and innovators of the future.

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
Brown, Terra	Assistant Principal	
Alexander, Brianne	Other	
	School Counselor	
Dougherty, James	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, James Dougherty

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

1

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

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

673

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

11

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

11

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	91	108	100	108	115	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	632
Attendance below 90 percent	39	36	38	40	45	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
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	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	10	21	36	33	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	5	6	12	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	80	101	93	120	95	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	20	31	29	36	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	80	101	93	120	95	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	588
Attendance below 90 percent	20	31	29	36	23	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	168
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	15	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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				47%	52%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	57%	58%	54%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64%	55%	53%	54%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	63%	63%	52%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	68%	62%	68%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	53%	51%	65%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				52%	48%	53%	47%	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	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	47%	52%	-5%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	41%	60%	-19%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	37%	65%	-28%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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.

School-based progress monitoring is done using iReady diagnostic assessment for 1st and 2nd grade. In grades 3, 4, and 5 the district benchmark assessment is used to progress monitor.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	94 / 30%	84 / 36%	91 / 64%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62 / 24.1%	55 / 29.1%	58 / 58.6%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 17.6%	15 / 26.7%	15 / 46.7%
	English Language Learners	17 / 17.6%	14 / 14.3%	17 / 29.4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	93 / 25%	83 / 31%	91 / 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60 / 20%	54 / 24.1%	58 / 46.6%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 5.9%	15 / 6.7%	15 / 46.7%
	English Language Learners	16 / 25%	15 / 6.7%	17 / 17.6%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	89 / 24%	75 / 42%	78 / 54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53 / 20.7%	46 / 37%	45/44.5%
	Students With Disabilities	16 / 12.5%	12 / 0%	12/8.3%
	English Language Learners	14 / 7%	14 / 14.3%	14/21.4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	87 / 19%	74 / 40%	78 / 63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53 / 13%	46 / 30.4%	45 / 57.8%
	Students With Disabilities	16 / 12.5%	12 / 8.3%	12 / 16.7%
	English Language Learners	14 / 7%	14 / 7.1%	14 / 28.6%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	107 / 49.6%	110 / 49.1%	105 / 47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63 / 36.6%	67 / 37.3%	68 / 38%
	Students With Disabilities	30 / 13.3%	31 / 9.7%	31 / 13%
	English Language Learners	13 / 21.3%	14 / 14.3%	15 / 7%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	107 / 43.9%	110 / 43.7%	104 / 60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66 / 37.9%	68 / 35.3%	68 / 48.5%
	Students With Disabilities	29 / 20.6%	29 / 24.1%	31 / 22.5%
	English Language Learners	15 / 26.7%	15 / 13.4%	14 / 21.4%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	79 / 46.9%	82 / 32.9%	76 / 41%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50 / 34%	54 / 24.1%	56 / 30%
	Students With Disabilities	10 / 0%	11 / 18.2%	12 / 25%
	English Language Learners	15 / 20%	23 / 17.3%	24 / 21%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	71 / 32.4%	80 / 17.6%	79 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	43 / 16.3%	53 / 9.4%	61 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	6 / 16.7%	11 / 9.1%	12 / 25%
	English Language Learners	23 / 8.7%	23 / 4.3%	26 / 27%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	94 / 49%	83 / 39.8%	87 / 45%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63 / 44.4%	56 / 30.4%	65 / 38.4%
	Students With Disabilities	18 / 5.6%	18 / 11.1%	20 / 5%
	English Language Learners	17 / 17.6%	17 / 29.4%	19 / 26.3%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	90 / 47.8%	83 / 39.8%	88 / 55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	59 / 38.9%	55 / 32.7%	63 / 48%
	Students With Disabilities	17 / 17.6%	19 / 15.8%	19 / 32%
	English Language Learners	17 / 11.8%	18 / 16.7%	16 / 37.5%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	91 / 40.7%	82 / 42.7%	88 / 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60 / 31.6%	55 / 34.5%	61 / 27.8%
	Students With Disabilities	16 / 12.6%	19 / 10.6%	18 / 6%
	English Language Learners	17 / 23.5%	18 / 11.2%	18 / 17%

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	16	17	17	26	36		9				
ELL	21	28	9	35	71		19				
BLK	35	57		50	67		21				
HSP	33	25	9	44	57	55	29				
MUL	56			56							
WHT	56	52		63	67		47				
FRL	35	35	19	46	60	53	31				
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	21	50	70	23	46	48	11				
ELL	20	54	71	44	57	47	27				
BLK	34	44	50	32	50	29	33				
HSP	31	58	68	43	62	50	37				
MUL	47	69		47	62						
WHT	65	52		60	63		75				
FRL	39	54	64	42	56	44	44				
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	13	45	46	24	59	75	16				
ELL	27	55	75	43	50	62					
BLK	25	55	53	36	63	61					
HSP	31	46	56	41	55	75	31				
MUL	44			44							
WHT	65	60	60	70	81		72				
FRL	39	51	54	45	63	67	40				

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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	39
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
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	57
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	42
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 Math the ELL subgroup is the lowest performing subgroups across 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade.
- In ELA and Math the SWD subgroups are among the lowest across 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade.
- 3rd and 5th grade ELA achievement is below district average of 49%.
- 4th grade achievement in Math is low overall

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

- 4th grade ELA achievement has been traditionally low based on current and 2019 FSA data.
- 4th grade Math achievement has been traditionally low based on current and 2019 FSA data.

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

- Based on low achievements scores the level of rigor did not meet the expectations of the standards. Data driven standards based planning would be an action to take to make improvements in these areas.

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

-3rd grade ELA and Math has showed improvement based off of school based data compared to the 2019 state assessments.

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

-Standards based planning and data driven instruction was taken as a top priority by the 3rd grade instruction team during the 2020-2021 school year.

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

- Teacher collaborative teams
- Data-driven planning
- Tiered small group instruction

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

- Multiple data chat meetings
- Professional learning opportunities on best practices
- Professional development in Science
- Standards-based planning with instructional coach and/or administration present
- BEST standards professional development opportunities
- Literacy Footprints program from Kindergarten through 3rd grade with professional development opportunities

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

- Tiered small group instruction to include the use of SIPPS program
- Building capacity of our team leaders through providing leadership opportunities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: -ELA proficiency is 5% below the district average based on 2021 FSA data.

Measurable Outcome: Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency in ELA from 44% to 55% by May 2022 as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.

Monitoring: -School-based formative assessments
-District quarterly benchmark assessments
-iReady Diagnostic assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: -Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor. This is based on 2019 FSA, 2020 school-based, and 2021 FSA data that showed deficits in ELA achievement and learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: -In order to close the achievement gap, Bashaw's administrative staff will ensure that teachers are instructing students on the needed standards with the highest level of rigor. To do this staff members will participate in data-driven, standards based planning with the support of the Bashaw's Reading Coach and/or administrative team members.

Action Steps to Implement

Review 2021 FSA data with teachers to determine areas of need, instructional groups, and identify needed professional development based on areas of need.

Person Responsible James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Participation in teacher collaborative teams on multiple occasions throughout the course of each month. Continual review of data for consistent readjustment in student groupings and instruction.

Person Responsible James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	-Based on 2021 FSA data more support and resources need to be provided towards our lowest 25% of students in order to increase their proficiency and learning gains.
Measurable Outcome:	Bashaw Elementary will increase our learning gains in ELA for our lowest 25% of students from 19% as measured in 2021 FSA data to 70% by May 2022 as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -School-based formative assessments -District quarterly benchmark assessments -iReady Diagnostic assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terra Brown (brown2t@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Implementation of Tier 3 differentiated instruction -Monitoring of progress of L25% students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Identification of our students with the largest learning achievement gaps will allow us to adjust targeted instruction that will address the specific needs of our highest need students.

Action Steps to Implement

- Identify students in need of Tier 3 level instruction and intervention through communication and collaboration with Bashaw teachers.
- Identify students that are in the lowest 25% quartile in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible Terra Brown (brown2t@manateeschools.net)

- Train teachers in use of SIPPS for Tier 3 students, monitor the use of resources and instruction during Tier 3 remediation. This includes continual progress monitoring and adjustment as needed.

Person Responsible Terra Brown (brown2t@manateeschools.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

According to our ESSA Federal Index data our two subgroups that fall below the 41% threshold. Those two subgroups being 38% SWD and 39% Black/African American.

Measurable Outcome:

-Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency of our Black/African American students in ELA from 34% to 55% by May 2022 as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.

-Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency of our students with disabilities in ELA from 21% to 55% by May 2022 as measured by the Florida Standards Assessment in ELA.

Monitoring:

These two subgroups will be progress monitored by teachers, instructional coaches, and administrative team and adjustments made to groupings and instruction based on data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

-Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor. This is based on 2019 FSA, 2020 school-based, and 2021 FSA data that showed deficits in ELA achievement and learning gains with a focus on our two identified subgroups SWD and Black/African American.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

-In order to close the achievement gap, Bashaw's administrative staff will ensure that teachers are instructing students on the needed standards with the highest level of rigor. To do this staff members will participate in data-driven, standards based planning with the support of the Bashaw's Reading Coach and/or administrative team members.

Action Steps to Implement

Review 2021 FSA data with teachers to determine areas of need, instructional groups, and identify the areas of need for students with disabilities and Black/African American students.

Person Responsible

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Participation in teacher collaborative teams on multiple occasions throughout the course of each month. Continual review of data for consistent readjustment in instruction for students in identified subgroups.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

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.

-School has established a climate and culture committee that will review student discipline data on a monthly basis, identify trends in student behavior, and problem solve areas of need.

-Student climate survey created by school counselor and student support specialist that has been published to students in order to measure their feelings of safety while on campus.

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.

- Establishment of school culture and climate committee.
- Various forms of communication to students and staff of various SEL components through morning news program, classroom visits, SEL lessons, and school assemblies such as pep rallies.
- Use of SAC community stakeholders, communication of school-wide needs, current SEL initiatives, and updates on campus culture and environment.

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

- James Dougherty, Principal - Building capacity for school stakeholders, participation and guidance in the development and implementation of school-wide SEL and Positive Behavior programs.
- Terra Brown, Assistant Principal - Building capacity for school stakeholders, participation and guidance in the development and implementation of school-wide SEL and Positive Behavior programs.
- Morgan Reinhart, School Counselor - Character Strong SEL program coordinator
- Brianne Carlisle, Student Support Specialist - Positive Behavior Support coordinator

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: Differentiation	\$0.00

3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00