

Sarasota County Schools

Atwater Elementary



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Atwater Elementary

4701 HUNTSVILLE AVE, North Port, FL 34288

www.sarasotacountyschools.net/atwater

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">65%</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;">37%</p>

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	<p>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.</p>
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	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	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	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	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					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		27	52	77
	Economically Disadvantaged		14	71	89
	Students With Disabilities		0	0	31
	English Language Learners		25	38	33
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		13	42	74
	Economically Disadvantaged		13	42	83
	Students With Disabilities		9	0	15
	English Language Learners		13	38	83
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		39	54	81
	Economically Disadvantaged		28	46	69
	Students With Disabilities		17	30	61
	English Language Learners		0	0	60
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		18	37	75
	Economically Disadvantaged		9	39	69
	Students With Disabilities		5	22	70
	English Language Learners		0	33	60
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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

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

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