

Manatee County Public Schools

Barbara A Harvey 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 | 22 |

Barbara A Harvey Elementary School

8610 115TH AVE E, Parrish, FL 34219

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

Demographics

Principal: Hayley Rio

Start Date for this Principal: 3/1/2019

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 37% |
| 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: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade |
| 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 | 22 |

Barbara A Harvey Elementary School

8610 115TH AVE E, Parrish, FL 34219

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">32%</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;">34%</p> |

School Grades History

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <p>Year</p> <p>Grade</p> | <p>2020-21</p> |
|--|-----------------------|

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.

Barbara Harvey Elementary reflects our namesake: Passionate and dedicated educators who treat everyone like family. We give away hugs while elevating academic success. We care for each child, finding their learning style and adapting to their needs. We connect with parents and the community to produce socially responsible citizens of the world. We make memories every day in a warm and friendly environment so students feel valued. Our passion is contagious!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We will create a sense of family while providing lifelong memories for our students and instilling a passion for learning.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| Rio, Hayley | Principal | To ensure the safety and security of our campus while providing a highly effective instructional learning environment for our students and staff. Duties include reviewing and monitoring safety concerns, monitoring data, providing professional learning for staff, involving the community, and monitoring the overall instructional environment. |
| Keezer, Andrea | Assistant Principal | To ensure the safety and security of our campus while providing a highly effective instructional learning environment for our students and staff. Duties include reviewing and monitoring safety concerns, monitoring data, providing professional learning for staff, involving the community, and monitoring the overall instructional environment. |
| Whightsel, Kristina | | To support the administration in their duties and also co-chair the Intensive Support Team to assist teachers in identifying students needing tier 2 and 3 interventions, develop and monitoring interventions and next steps. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 3/1/2019, Hayley Rio

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
56

Total number of students enrolled at the school
903

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
17

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 | 145 | 170 | 141 | 162 | 116 | 117 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 851 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 52 | 46 | 27 | 48 | 24 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 220 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 65 |
| 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 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 25 | 24 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |

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 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/9/2021

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 | 133 | 110 | 98 | 94 | 93 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 635 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 133 | 110 | 98 | 94 | 93 | 107 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 635 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| 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 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | | | | | 52% | 57% | | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | 57% | 58% | | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 55% | 53% | | 47% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | | 63% | 63% | | 60% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | 68% | 62% | | 61% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | 53% | 51% | | 47% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | | 48% | 53% | | 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 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| 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: i-Ready

Grades 3-5: Benchmark Test 1, Benchmark Test 2 and FSA

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 28.2% | | 56.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 34.4% | | 47.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20% | | 36.4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | | 14.3 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12.7% | | 53.9 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6.8% | | 34.9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6.7% | | 50 |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | | 0 |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 32% | | 63.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12.8% | | 44.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 7.1% | | 30 |
| | English Language Learners | 7.1% | | 35.7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12.4% | | 50 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 4.3% | | 29.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15.4% | | 22.2 |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | | 30.8 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 52.6 | 57.7 | 55.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 32.6 | 44.7 | 45.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24.1 | 25 | 21.1 |
| | English Language Learners | 42.6 | 31.3 | 33.3 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 51.5 | 65 | 55.6 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 45.5 | 55.3 | 47.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25 | 30 | 41.2 |
| | English Language Learners | 26.7 | 43.8 | 31.3 |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 53.2 | 57.4 | 60.2 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28.1 | 41.2 | 38.2 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 13.3 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 11.1 | 33.3 | 12.5 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 64.9 | 64.1 | 79.3 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 43.8 | 57.6 | 69.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 26.7 | 37.5 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 22.2 | 22.2 | 37.5 |

| Grade 5 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 59.6 | 57 | 64.5 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 37.5 | 33.3 | 38.5 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 11.1 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| | English Language Learners | | 13.3 | 14.3 | 13.3 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 70.1 | 74.3 | 80.4 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 50 | 53.7 | 66.7 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 22.2 | 23.5 | 41.2 |
| | English Language Learners | | 33.3 | 33.3 | 46.7 |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | 55.7 | 62 | 69.3 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 38.5 | 43.9 | 50 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 17.6 | 29.4 | 18.8 |
| | English Language Learners | | 20 | 21.4 | 13.3 |
| | | 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 | 40 | 38 | 59 | | 25 | | | | |
| ELL | 22 | 43 | | 43 | 64 | | 21 | | | | |
| ASN | 82 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 21 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 33 | 50 | 46 | 52 | 77 | 80 | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 74 | | 85 | 94 | 90 | 87 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 49 | 60 | 60 | 71 | 77 | 53 | | | | |
| 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 |

| 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 |

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 | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 549 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

| | |
|---|-----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 |
| 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 | 42 |
| 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 | 78 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 55 |
| 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 | 80 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 84 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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?

It seems the higher in grade our students get in grades 3-5, proficiency too increases. This holds true for both ELA and Mathematics. Our ELL and SWD students have lower data than students not in those subgroups. Economically disadvantaged students perform better in ELA than they do in math.

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

As a newer school, we do not have any 2019 data from FSA to reflect on, however we have been progress monitoring. We see our students in general seem to perform higher in the area of mathematics than they do in ELA. Our ELL students score lower in math than ELA. We need to work on all of our subgroup population in the area of both ELA and mathematics.

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

We believe some of the contributing factors for the need for improvement include eLearning due to COVID, staff shortages and higher class numbers due to our growth and less support for small group differentiated instruction. We will identify and work with specific students in each of our subgroups to help lessen the gap in achievement in both ELA and mathematics.

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

This need in the area of ELA is holding consistent since our opening year in 2019. The area of mathematics has shown growth.

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

We believe the use of the Acaletics math program to fidelity is one of the major contributors to this improvement.

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

We will need additional staff in place to pull and support small group, differentiated instruction. Administration will happily work with students in our subgroups in both ELA and mathematics.

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

We will offer professional development in the area of collaborative learning. This will allow students to maintain engagement while learning in small groups with their peers. Students in subgroups will be able to support each other through collaboration.

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

We will hire additional teachers to lessen the number of students in each classroom, or to provide support through small group instruction. We will maintain these teachers going forward.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning gains for our lowest quartile students are especially important so that these lowest achieving students are making academic growth while also contributing to our school grade in the areas of lowest quartile learning gains, overall learning gains, and also proficiency. Our students with disabilities and ELL students have the greatest area for improvement.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 21-22 school year, at least 60% of Harvey Elementary's lowest quartile students will demonstrate learning gains as evidenced by the ELA portion of the FSA.

Monitoring: Classroom and district assessments will be conducted regularly and used to monitor student progress. In addition, administration will conduct walkthroughs in classrooms and a regular review of lesson plans to ensure that targeted instruction is occurring for students. Data will be reviewed during regular data meetings with the grade level teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: i-Ready, LLI, and SIPPS will be utilized as supplemental resources for remediation and in some cases, as an intervention. There is a schoolwide remediation time and a support team to facilitate the utilization of these resources. Time will be provided through weekly TLC's for teachers to collaborate with standards based planning. Data meetings will be held regularly to monitor student progress and make adjustments to instruction, as needed. The MTSS process will be initiated for students, when appropriate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: i-Ready, LLI, and SIPPS are research based programs that are accepted by Manatee County as supplemental resources and for intervention purposes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide schedule and support staff for schoolwide remediation block.
2. Secure LLI materials and provide training to staff.
3. Utilize TLC's for collaborative planning and data review.
4. Monitor student growth through use of data charts and review.
5. Adjust instruction and provide professional learning for teachers, as needed.

Person Responsible Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Learning gains for our lowest quartile students are especially important so that these lowest achieving students are making academic growth while also contributing to our school grade in the areas of lowest quartile learning gains, overall learning gains, and proficiency. Our greatest opportunity for growth is with our students with disabilities and our ELL students.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the 21-22 school year, at least 60% of Harvey Elementary's lowest quartile students will demonstrate learning gains as evidenced by the math portion of the FSA.

Monitoring: Classroom and district assessments will be conducted regularly and used to monitor student progress. In addition, administration will conduct walkthroughs in classrooms and a regular review of lesson plans to ensure that targeted instruction is occurring for students. Data will be reviewed during regular data meetings with the grade level teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: i-Ready may be utilized as a remediation tool and as an intervention, if needed. Envision math is being utilized as a core instructional material. In addition, Acaletics is being utilized with our 4th and 5th grade students. Time will be provided through weekly TLC's for teachers to collaborate with standards based planning. Data meetings will be held regularly to monitor student progress and make adjustments to instruction. The MTSS process will be initiated for students, when appropriate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: i-Ready is a research based program that is accepted by Manatee County as an intervention. Envision was chosen as the District adopted math textbook series and Acaletics has been purchased as a supplemental resource.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Encourage teachers to attend any available Envision and Acaletics math training.
2. Provide an opportunity for teacher to receive instructional support from our District Curriculum Specialist and school based master teachers.
3. Utilize TLC's for collaborative planning and data review.
4. Monitor student growth through use of data charts and review.
5. Adjust instruction and provide additional professional learning opportunities for teachers, as needed.

Person Responsible Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Subgroups comprise our population at Harvey Elementary. It is important that all of our students demonstrate proficiency and make learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

By the end of the 21-22 school year, at least 50% of the students in third through fifth grade in the subgroups at Harvey Elementary will demonstrate proficiency and learning gains as evidenced by the ELA and math portions of the FSA.

Monitoring:

Classroom and district assessments will be conducted regularly and used to monitor student progress. In addition, administration will conduct walkthroughs in classrooms and a regular review of lesson plans to ensure that targeted instruction is occurring for students. Data will be reviewed during regular data meetings with the grade level teams.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Hayley Rio (rio2h@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Time will be provided through weekly TLC's for teachers to collaborate with standards based planning. Data meetings will be held regularly to monitor student progress and make adjustments to instruction. Data collection methods (data charts and progress monitoring spreadsheet) will include the identification of the students in our subgroups. Students will be supported through the MTSS process, as needed. Instructional resources will include: i-Ready, core curriculum materials, LLI, Acaletics, and evidenced based interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The instructional materials being utilized are on the State approved list of instructional materials or have been identified by the District as programs that are appropriate as supplemental resources or intervention programs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students that comprise the subgroups at Harvey.
2. Inform the teachers of the subgroups and the composition of those groups.
3. Utilize our data collection methods and incorporate the identification of the students' subgroups.
4. Monitor progress, adjust instruction as needed and initiate the MTSS process when appropriate.
5. Provide professional development for teachers in identified areas of need.

Person Responsible

Andrea Keezer (keezera@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.

- **No incidents of aggression occurred during appropriately leveled rigorous instructional time. We consider instruction to be our strength.**
- **Differentiation should occur during each lesson. Meeting the students where their individual needs are should reduce behavior situations. When we do not properly differentiate, behavior infractions occur.**
- **Our school environment is in a unique state due to us being a newer school and having had many interruptions in our first two school years due to COVID.**
- **Behaviors do not occur in a highly structured and organized environment.**
- **In less structured environments (playground, lunchroom, classrooms with less differentiation), students have more frequent behaviors.**

Our goal is:

- 1. Our school counselor will become a part of the specials rotation to initiate/implement SEL resources and strategies across the school. By end of 21-22 school year, we expect an 80% increase of staff/classroom involvement to positively impact school culture.**

How to address this goal:

- 1a. Weekly implementation of SEL curriculum.**
- 1b. At least 80% of classrooms will implement SEL based lessons direct to instruction.**
- 1c. Quarterly meeting and review with SEL/PBS to discuss concerns, impact and student participation.**

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.

Faculty Commitment

Evident daily. New staff members will be 'onboarded' by teammates and administration.

Effective Procedures for Discipline

Most teachers handle situations, however other teachers could use a few more tools in their toolboxes.

Data Entry & Analysis

We use morning show, and student ambassadors to communicate via the announcements.

Expectations & Rules

SHARK Expectation for whole school drive classroom behavior plan

Reward/Recognition Program

We use Fantastic Actions to recognize individual students and adults on campus. We use a House System to award points for students/staff showing positive character traits.

Lesson Plans for Teaching Behavior

We will begin fully implementing our Character Strong program through our specials rotation.

Implementation Plan

We have a full implementation plan and timeline

Classroom Systems

We do require our teachers to use our SHARK expectations in addition to any management plan they choose to use.

Evaluation

We do evaluate our plan based on referral numbers, attendance numbers, and academic progress

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

Administration- Oversee and support implementation of goal, expectations and resources.

Staff- Everyone takes ownership of our students collectively and promotes a positive culture and environment.

Students- Take an active role and ownership in the school environment and promote the expectations with their peer group.

Parents- Have an awareness of the culture at Harvey and the expectations carry through to the home environment.

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 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |