Sea Breeze Elementary School

leadership
analysis
Florida
students
college and career
mission
ambitious
school improvement
family and community involvement
striving
achievement
teaching
relationships
success
areas of focus
instruction
resources
supportive environment
growth
needs assessment
strategic planning
collaboration
vision
learning

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/seabreeze

Demographics

Principal: Aliki Bovoletis

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	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: C (49%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	<u>Lucinda Thompson</u>
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

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

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/seabreeze

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	63%

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.

Sea Breeze Elementary School strives to maintain high expectations and promote academic excellence for all students by creating a positive school climate which respects and values diversity and nurtures self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sea Breeze Elementary School values all our students and diversity. Communication among all stakeholders is important to support high academic standards.

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
VanOverbeke, Tami	Principal	Oversee all operation building-wide
Mueller, Mark	Assistant Principal	
Shapiro, Samantha	Behavior Specialist	
	Reading Coach	
Darby, Mark	School Counselor	
Kozlowski, Eric	Instructional Media	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Aliki Bovoletis

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.*
0

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Total number of students enrolled at the school
525

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
20

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	73	92	89	91	65	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	23	37	35	32	33	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	10	17	39	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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
Tuesday 9/7/2021

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	83	80	82	60	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	6	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	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	

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	0	0	0	6	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	83	80	82	60	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	453
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	1	4	1	6	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
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	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	

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	0	0	0	6	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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				50%	52%	57%	49%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				52%	57%	58%	56%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	55%	53%	46%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	62%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				52%	68%	62%	70%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				29%	53%	51%	53%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	48%	53%	54%	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	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	52%	-6%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	65%	-14%	64%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	53%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Reading and Math Diagnostic data from the Fall, Winter, and Spring
Science Benchmark assessment data from Fall and Winter

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/18.6	35/40.2	59/67.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/12.5	24/36.9	44/67.7
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	5/55.6
	English Language Learners	3/18.8	5/31.3	8/50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/11.9	23/26.4	47/53.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/7.9	16/24.6	34/52.3
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	0/0	4/25

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/18.8	33/39.8	41/48.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/14	17/33.3	25/48.1
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	2/14.3	3/21.4
	English Language Learners	1/8.3	5/38.5	6/46.2
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/8.8	28/34.1	39/46.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/10	15/30	21/40.4
	Students With Disabilities	1/6.7	3/23.1	2/14.3
	English Language Learners	3/25	5/38.5	5/38.5

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/43.4	54/62	62/71.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	25/43.1	40/65.6	43/70.5
	Students With Disabilities	4/18.2	9/39.1	9/39.1
	English Language Learners	6/28.6	9/42.9	13/60.9
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	7/8.6	21/25.9	38/47.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	3/5.4	13/22.8	25/43.9
	Students With Disabilities	1/4.8	3/14.3	7/36.8
	English Language Learners	1/5	3/15.8	8/40

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/13.3	22/37.3	17/30.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/11.4	13/30.2	9/22.5
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/11.8	1/6.7
	English Language Learners	1/10	5/50	5/50
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/61.4	2/16.7	22/42.3
	Economically Disadvantaged	1/2.4	1/11.1	16/39
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	6/42.9
	English Language Learners	1/10	0/0	4/44.4

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21/29.2	23/30.6	18/28.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	12/25.5	12/24.5	9/21.4
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/9.1
	English Language Learners	2/15.4	3/23.1	2/15.4
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	45/63.4	25/36.8	29/52.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/17.4	16/32.7	18/46.2
	Students With Disabilities	1/8.3	1/9.1	1/11.1
	English Language Learners	3/25	4/33.3	5/41.7
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/23.9	22/33.8	
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/21.9	12/27.9	
	Students With Disabilities	1/9.1	0/0	
	English Language Learners	2/18.2	4/33.3	

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	19	28	45	27	33	40					
ELL	37			37			40				
BLK	38	35		39	44		50				
HSP	34	37		36	53		35				
MUL	50			69							
WHT	55	45		62	55		50				
FRL	39	31	42	43	46	43	39				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	44	50	40	49	29	35				
ELL	34	50	65	48	50	36	29				
BLK	40	51	54	48	33	16	38				
HSP	43	52	58	49	52	42	36				
MUL	53	55		65	55						
WHT	57	51	60	69	60	27	57				
FRL	46	48	51	56	50	31	45				

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	27	49	43	35	49	40	20				
ELL	17	44	36	37	72	55					
BLK	42	64	56	40	54	56	52				
HSP	30	41	40	56	63	55	40				
MUL	56	83		76	82						
WHT	61	54	36	74	77	38	59				
FRL	44	54	47	60	69	53	53				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	347

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	25
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	36
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	41
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	38
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	60
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	53
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

ELL and SWD students are underperforming compared to non-ELL and non-SWD in reading and math across all grade levels. African American students are performing below the 41% percentile. ELA proficiency is greater than math proficiency in grades 1-3.

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

The lowest 25th percentile in math is the area with the greatest need of improvement followed by science achievement based on 2019 state assessments. Increasing proficiency of the ELL and SWD students is the greatest need based on progress monitoring. Closing the achievement gap for African American students is identified as a need based on the subgroup data review.

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

A contributing factor is a need to focus support utilizing coaches, intervention, and additional staff in the identified areas. We need to identify students who are in one or more of the identified areas of need, provide targeted support, and progress monitor closely to ensure academic growth and gains.

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

Overall math achievement is the only area of improvement from 2018 to 2019.

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

A contributing factor is a need to identify students who are not making academic gains in all content areas. To address student achievement and gains needs, students need to be progress monitoring and tracked to ensure all students are making gains towards or achieving at grade level.

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

We will identify students in need of support, provide support, and progress monitor to ensure progress. Acaletics and the additional hour of reading instruction will be implemented with fidelity. Collaborative planning meetings will occur monthly for ELA and math with a focus on rigor and pacing.

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.

Monthly collaborative planning in reading and math, targeted support from the reading coach, and training to support the current standards will be provided to support teachers. Leaders will attend district provided trainings to support the enhancement and development of teachers.

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

Collaborative planning in ELA and math, reading coach support, professional development surrounding the standards and rigor, monthly staff meetings with a focus on data, identification of students in need of support, tracking of student data to ensure achievement, and fidelity implementation of core and tiered programs and resources.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA achievement and learning gains are have declined from 2018 to present based on FSA 2018, 2019, and 2021 data.
Measurable Outcome:	Grades 3-5 overall learning gains as measured by the 2022 FSA in ELA will increase from 52% to at least 70%. Grades 3-5 overall bottom quartile learning gains as measured by the 2022 FSA in ELA will increase from 56% to at least 65% Grades 3-5 student proficiency as measured by the 2022 FSA in ELA will increase from 42% to at least 50%.
Monitoring:	In kindergarten through second grades, progress will be monitored using formal and informal monthly running records, the beginning, middle, and end of year iReady diagnostic assessments, and quarterly benchmark assessments (second grade only). In third through fifth grades, progress will be monitored using common assessments, the beginning, middle, and end of year iReady diagnostic assessments, and quarterly benchmark assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mark Mueller (muellerm2@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In kindergarten through second grades, guided reading groups using the Literacy Footprints and Literacy Footprints Intervention kits will be implemented within the 90 minute reading block and the Tiered intervention hour. In third through fifth grades, Tiered interventions (SRA Corrective, Wonders Tier 2 materials, and HMH Close Reading in Science) and Reading/Writing project text sets will be implemented.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The identified resources are adopted by the district and align with district reading initiative guidelines as well as being systematic, sequential, and multi-sensory.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers who have not previously received training in Literacy Footprints, Corrective Reading, and/or reading/writing project text sets.

Person Responsible	Mark Mueller (muellerm2@manateeschools.net)

2. Provide additional training support or coaching cycles (reading coach) for teachers who need assistance or support implementing the identified programs.

Person Responsible	Mark Mueller (muellerm2@manateeschools.net)

3. Conduct fidelity monitoring

Person Responsible	Mark Mueller (muellerm2@manateeschools.net)

4. Implement progress monitoring and support with data chats

Person Responsible	Mark Mueller (muellerm2@manateeschools.net)

5. Implement monthly collaborative planning

Person Responsible	Mark Mueller (muellerm2@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math achievement and learning gains are have declined from 2018 to present based on FSA 2018, 2019, and 2021 data.
Measurable Outcome:	Grades 3-5 overall learning gains as measured by the 2022 FSA in Math will increase from 52% to at least 75%. Grades 3-5 overall bottom quartile learning gains as measured by the 2022 FSA in Math will increase from 29% to at least 70%. Grades 3-5 student proficiency as measured by the 2022 FSA in Math will increase from 47% to at least 57%>
Monitoring:	In kindergarten through second grades, the iReady beginning, middle, and end of year diagnostic assessments and common assessments using Envision resources will be used to monitor . District benchmark assessments will be used in second year. In third through fifth grades, the iReady beginning, middle, and end of year diagnostic assessments, common assessments using Envision resources, and district benchmarks will be used to monitor progress towards desired outcomes.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics is being implementing in kindergarten through fifth grades.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics is supported by the district and expected to be implemented in 4th and 5th grades.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Train teachers who lack appropriate training in Acaletics.

Person Responsible	Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

2. Monitor fidelity

Person Responsible	Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

3. Implement monthly collaborative math planning to support acaletics and the math block.

Person Responsible	Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

4. Provide a coaching/feedback loop

Person Responsible	Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

5. Use Acaletics grouping strategies and celebrate success

Person Responsible	Tami VanOverbeke (vanoverbeket@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Comparable Manatee County Elementary Schools Referral Data:
Total Number of Referrals Total Number of Students with Referrals
Able: 154 54
Bayshore: 243 109
Moody: 159 73
Sea Breeze: 71 33

After reviewing data above we have determined that our school's number of referrals are the lowest in the cluster of schools with comparable socioeconomical standing as Sea Breeze. We plan to use positive reinforcement, SEL, and connecting with students/families to continue to lessen the number of referrals at our school. Creating a school culture of setting clear expectations, holding students accountable, and making student center decisions will continue to support our plan. Our Student Behavior Committee will meet monthly to disaggregate the data, look at trends, respond to the trends, and develop proactive behavior supports and implement as necessary.

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.

To build staff cohesiveness and a positive school culture, we kicked off the 2021-2022 school year by looking at our staff, student, and school expectations through the lenses of what does this look like, sound like, and feel like. This enabled teachers to play a crucial role in determining what we expect of our peers, our administration/leadership, and our students. We are integrating staff celebrations, community building activities, and staff functions to build togetherness and build a sense of family. The kickoff tasks were transitioned to the classrooms so that students have a role in building classroom culture and ownership. As we move forward, valuing each other, opinions, trust, shared leadership, and individual as well as group ownership includes our relationships with our families, business partners, and community partners.

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

Stakeholders:
*School-based School Improvement committee: creating and communicating the school improvement plan
*Instructional Leadership Team: Supporting teachers in promoting and maintaining a positive culture and environment
*Grants, Business partnerships, and Parent/Community Involvement committee: Involve the community and business partners with our school
*Local partnerships with businesses: Enhance community
*Local community partnerships: Enhance community

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: Math	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**