# Atwater Elementary



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Atwater Elementary

4701 HUNTSVILLE AVE, North Port, FL 34288

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/atwater

## Demographics

## Principal: Cynthia Thro

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | 72% |
| **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: A (68%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (61%) |
| **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 Sarasota 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

# Atwater Elementary

## 4701 HUNTSVILLE AVE, North Port, FL 34288

### www.sarasotacountyschools.net/atwater

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2020-21 Title I School** | **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5 | Yes | 65% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 37% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sarasota 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 Atwater Elementary School is to equip our students and staff to achieve "All-Star" levels of success in teaching and learning through the use of collaboration, technology, family and community involvement, and differentiated instruction.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Excellence in Academics and Character

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Thro, Cynthia | Principal | The School Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss individual students and their progress towards mastery of the grade-level curriculum and any behavioral concerns. This multi-disciplinary team is responsible for aligning the needs of the students to the interventions and instruction needed. The members of the team meet with grade level teams to discuss students' progress. The Leadership Team is the overarching team that conducts ongoing progress monitoring of students' performance data when it is related to their interventions and academic/behavioral progress. We also have a Student Support Team that assists with the implementation of the approved research-based intervention plans. We coordinate and implement our Title 1, Part A program to provide supplemental services to our families. In addition to using our funds to enhance after-school tutoring program materials, our Title 1 dollars are used to contract additional staff who provide our students with supplemental instruction. Our Parent Involvement funds are used to establish parent conference nights and provide parent training and family involvement events. Our school stresses ongoing professional development for our staff. As such, we use our professional development allocations to provide our staff with additional training in a number of areas that support student growth and achievement in all educational and social/emotional areas. Atwater continues the visible learning multi-year learning cycle this year including the focal points of analyzing teaching for student results and CHAMPs; creating a multi-layer approach to enhance and increase student achievement through collective efficacy and specific feedback. |
| Kisner, Jaime | Assistant Principal | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |
| Stonestreet, Vicki | School Counselor | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |
| Ramirez, Joy | Attendance/ Social Work | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |
| Blashinsky, Christina | Teacher, K-12 | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |
| Pikula, Rene | Instructional Coach | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |
| Rutherford, Brandi | Teacher, K-12 | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |
| Archer, Michele | Behavior Specialist | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Steiner, Ami | Other | Member of the School Leadership Team. See description of responsibilities under Principal tab. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 6/17/2018, Cynthia Thro

**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.*

8

**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.*

14

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

42

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

687

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

5

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

6

**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 | 103 | 99 | 100 | 107 | 97 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 621 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 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 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 9/20/2021

**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 | 99 | 95 | 90 | 104 | 99 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 597 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 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 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

### 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 | 99 | 95 | 90 | 104 | 99 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 597 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 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 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

## 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 | | | | 68% | 68% | 57% | 62% | 66% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 69% | 62% | 58% | 59% | 57% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65% | 53% | 53% | 48% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 75% | 73% | 63% | 65% | 72% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 76% | 67% | 62% | 64% | 63% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58% | 53% | 51% | 48% | 51% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 65% | 65% | 53% | 67% | 66% | 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 | 70% | 70% | 0% | 58% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 67% | -3% | 58% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -70% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 68% | 0% | 56% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -64% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 78% | 73% | 5% | 62% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 72% | 2% | 64% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -78% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 70% | -1% | 60% | 9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -74% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 65% | -1% | 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.**

The progress monitoring tool used for all grade levels was the Sarasota County Schools iReady Reading and Math Dashboard.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 27 | 52 | 77 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 14 | 71 | 89 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| | English Language Learners | 25 | 38 | 33 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 42 | 74 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 42 | 83 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9 | 0 | 15 |
| | English Language Learners | 13 | 38 | 83 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 39 | 54 | 81 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28 | 46 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 30 | 61 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18 | 37 | 75 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 39 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5 | 22 | 70 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 33 | 60 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 58 | 71 | 92 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39 | 49 | 79 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 30 | 65 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 40 | 86 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 17 | 43 | 71 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 33 | 65 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10 | 10 | 33 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 20 | 43 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42 | 56 | 69 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 61 | 70 | 93 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 12 | 20 | 21 |
| | English Language Learners | 17 | 0 | 38 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28 | 44 | 66 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 44 | 69 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 31 | 20 | 57 |
| | English Language Learners | 17 | 29 | 38 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **English Language Arts** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 45 | 57 | 72 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30 | 48 | 57 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 17 | 67 |
| **Mathematics** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 42 | 59 | 76 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 30 | 42 | 58 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 30 | 45 | 60 |
| | English Language Learners | 17 | 33 | 50 |
| **Science** | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | | | 63 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 59.3 |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 100 |
| | English Language Learners | | | 0 |

## 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 | 20 | 27 | | 44 | 53 | | 40 | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | 54 | | 73 | 54 | | 50 | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 63 | | 73 | 75 | | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 56 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | 53 | 27 | 71 | 56 | 35 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 59 | 63 | 50 | 66 | 53 | 36 | 61 | | | | |
| 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 | 27 | 50 | 64 | 50 | 65 | 52 | 14 | | | | |
| ELL | 51 | 68 | 80 | 54 | 71 | 64 | 21 | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | 77 | | 60 | 70 | 54 | 62 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| HSP | 62 | 68 | 67 | 64 | 71 | 56 | 46 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | 81 | | 71 | 71 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 67 | 57 | 80 | 78 | 59 | 68 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 68 | 64 | 73 | 75 | 56 | 62 | | | | |

| 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 | 26 | 29 | 27 | 38 | 46 | 34 | 26 | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 50 | 40 | 35 | 42 | 19 | 40 | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 55 | | 49 | 57 | 40 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 54 | 46 | 61 | 57 | 44 | 72 | | | | |
| MUL | 62 | 80 | | 65 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 59 | 46 | 68 | 66 | 49 | 66 | | | | |
| FRL | 60 | 57 | 49 | 63 | 61 | 45 | 65 | | | | |

## 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 | 56 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 65 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 448 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 37 |
| 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 | 62 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| 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 | 66 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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?**

The FSA data reveals growth in ELA and Math proficiency for grade 5. There was a decline in percent proficient in ELA and Math for grades 3 and 4. There was also a decline in overall learning gains and learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA and Math for grades 3-5. The progress monitoring data indicates growth in all areas and all grades 1-5; however, subgroup data shows a smaller percentage of proficiency across the year.

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

The data components indicating the greatest need for improvement are the learning gains of the bottom quartile in ELA and Math.

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

It is believed that the contributing factors to this need for improvement are the extra support, services and differentiation required for our students in the bottom quartile. In addition, remote learning/ concurrent teaching and inconsistent attendance have also contributed to this need. This need for improvement will be addressed by the following actions: standards-based planning, renewed focus on MTSS, student support teachers and contracted services working with students in the bottom quartile.

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

Based on FSA results, the percentage of students proficient for ELA and Math in grade 5 showed the most improvement.

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

Standards-based instruction and lesson planning, guided reading and differentiated instruction were contributing factors to the improvement. We also had some staffing changes, implemented GEER Up tutoring and provided additional support during the intervention block. The new actions were standard-based planning, staffing changes and tutoring, which will all continue this year.

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

Intensive intervention support provided by student support teachers and contracted services. Quarterly data chats by teachers and staff will result in more targeted instructional delivery. Continued

grade level team focus on standards-based lesson planning with increased engagement and level of rigor.

**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.**

The following opportunities will be provided for professional development in the areas of reading, writing, math and science: Book study on Whole Brain Teaching, Book Study When Readers Struggle, Book Study Shifting the Balance, literacy training by Reading Recovery teachers, training on new curriculum adoption for ELA, and individualized coaching by an instructional facilitator.

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

Some additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement are ongoing progress monitoring, quarterly data chats, and JumpStart tutoring

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Review of the 2021 data revealed a decrease in the percentage of students meeting proficiency in grades 3 and 4, the percentage of students making learning gains in grades 3-5 and the percentage of students in the bottom quartile making learning gains in grades 3-5 in ELA. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | By the end of the 2021-22 school year, ELA proficiency will increase from 63% to 67%, ELA learning gains will increase from 56% to 64% and students in the lowest 25th percentile making in gains in ELA will increase from 38% to 64% as measured by FSA |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored through ongoing progress monitoring, quarterly data chats, weekly iReady reviews and classroom walkthroughs with ongoing feedback. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teacher clarity: professional development and coaching aligned to the implementation of the new ELA adoption and BEST standards in order to plan meaningful, effective and engaging lessons |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teacher clarity allows for the narrowing and focusing of activities, as well as, reinforces the gradual release of responsibility of learning from the teacher to the students so that students feel ownership of their learning. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Teachers will use professional development focused on the new ELA adoption and understanding of the BEST standards to develop engaging lessons | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rene Pikula (rene.pikula@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| All teachers will participate in quarterly data chats to determine next steps for instruction in the content areas. Students performing below level will be identified and tracked, referring to SWST as appropriate | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Targeted students will participate in JumpStart Tutoring focused on improving reading and math proficiency | |
| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Teachers will plan and implement small group lessons that are standards-based and geared to meeting the needs of all students in their classroom. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| Flocabulary and Write Score have been added as additional resources | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net) |

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Review of the 2021 data revealed a decrease in the percentage of students meeting proficiency in grades 3 and 4, the percentage of students making learning gains in grades 3-5 and the percentage of students in the bottom quartile making learning gains in grades 3-5 in Math. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | By the end of the 2021-22 school year, Math proficiency will increase from 69% to 73%, Math learning gains will increase from 57% to 64% and students in the lowest 25th percentile making in gains in Math will increase from 38% to 64% as measured by FSA |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored through ongoing progress monitoring, quarterly data chats, weekly iReady reviews and classroom walkthroughs with ongoing feedback. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Evidence based strategies to be used include effective feedback, training to increase understanding of the BEST standards, and quarterly data chats to analyze data. In addition, selected students will receive additional intervention support from Student Support Teachers and Contracted services through Jump Start. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | These strategies focus on student data, building collective efficacy, include academic talk, goal setting, and student ownership. |

## Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will participate in quarterly data chats to determine next steps for instruction in the content areas. Students performing below level will be identified and tracked, referring to SWST as appropriate

**Person Responsible**   Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Targeted students will participate in JumpStart Tutoring focused on improving reading and math proficiency

**Person Responsible**   Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Reflex and Frax have been added as additional resources

**Person Responsible**   Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net)

Teachers will plan and implement small group lessons that are standards-based and geared to meeting the needs of all students in their class.

**Person Responsible**   Rene Pikula (rene.pikula@sarasotacountyschools.net)

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Review of the 2021 data revealed a decrease in the percentage of students meeting proficiency in the area of Science. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Science proficiency as measured by FSSA will increase from 62% to 66% |
| **Monitoring:** | This area of focus will be monitored through ongoing progress monitoring, quarterly data chats, benchmark assessments and classroom walkthroughs with ongoing feedback. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Standards-based science instruction will be provided in all classrooms and in the Science Lab on the specials wheel. Science Boot Camp will take place in the Spring for all 5th grade students to reinforce content through hands-on learning experiences. Students in Grades 3-5 will participate in district science benchmark testing providing formative data that will be analyzed and used to adjust instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Participation in hands-on and active learning with discussions increase student engagement and learning. Data chats to analyze benchmark results and plan instruction builds collective efficacy. Teachers will also use the data to provide feedback and goal setting with students. |

### Action Steps to Implement

All teachers will participate in quarterly data chats to determine next steps for instruction in the content areas.

| **Person Responsible** | Jaime Kisner (jaime.kisner@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
|---|---|

Planning, coaching and modeling of engaging science lessons

| **Person Responsible** | Rene Pikula (rene.pikula@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
|---|---|

The Science Lab teacher will host a Grade 5 Science Boot Camp with a review of Grade 3 and Grade 4 standards.

| **Person Responsible** | Rene Pikula (rene.pikula@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
|---|---|

Generation Genius has been added as an additional resource

| **Person Responsible** | Cynthia Thro (cynthia.thro@sarasotacountyschools.net) |
|---|---|

Grades 3-5 will participate in district formative benchmark assessments

| **Person Responsible** | Christina Blashinsky (christina.blashinsky@sarasotacountyschools.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.

**No data available**

## 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.**

At Atwater Elementary School we choose to create a community of learners that promotes a positive school culture and environment. Through our Positive Behavior Support Program, our school-wide declaration and H.E.A.R.T. expectations, we give our students the tools necessary to be successful members of our school and the community. Our school partners with Embracing Our Differences "to participate in creating a society where diversity is embraced and individuality is celebrated." We address equity by highlighting support staff and Atwater community members and organizations as resources for students, teachers, and families to help address their specific needs. We also invite stakeholders to participate in various committees that enable them to have a voice in the day-to-day dealings at our school. Finally, our spirit shirt is a very important component of our school, because it allows us to not only embrace our diversity and differences, but celebrate each other and build a sense of community. When we come together as a school and wear our spirit shirt, this unites our kids in creating a school-wide positive environment. Our message will be carried passed our school walls, and it will overflow into our community, ultimately, for all to see our common message and goal...to show our H.E.A.R.T. in all we do and treat others with respect and kindness.

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

Atwater's Parent Engagement Coordinator works with administrators and school staff to develop materials and trainings designed to provide support to families in understanding academic standards and assessments, monitoring student progress and how to work with teachers to improve student achievement. The Home School Liaison works closely with families to provide needed resources as well as support the home-school connection. Parents, business owners and community members participate on the SAC committee to provide input regarding important school decisions.

## 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: Science | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |