

Martin County School District

Felix A Williams 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	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Felix A Williams Elementary School

401 NW BAKER RD, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/fawes

Demographics

Principal: Sarah Tuthill

Start Date for this Principal: 4/7/2017

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)	42%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Martin 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	25

Felix A Williams Elementary School

401 NW BAKER RD, Stuart, FL 34994

martinschools.org/o/fawes

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="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">38%</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="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">24%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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 Felix A. Williams Elementary School is Every Student, Every Day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Felix A. Williams Elementary School is Empowerment Through Community.

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
Riley, Deborah	Principal	
McLeod, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Borrer, Scottie	Teacher, K-12	
Kujawa, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	
Posten, Loryn	Teacher, K-12	
Roberts, Angela	Teacher, K-12	
Torounian, Eileen	Teacher, K-12	
Aboujja, Kristine	Teacher, K-12	
Langlois, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	
Czerwinski, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Gagliardo, Julianne	Other	IPS Coach- ESE
Higgins, Kim	Teacher, K-12	Science Lab Teacher K-5
Baldwin, Valerie	Instructional Media	
Stull, Debra	ELL Compliance Specialist	District Coordinator ELL/Homeless/TitleIII

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 4/7/2017, Sarah Tuthill

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.*

2

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

569

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.

2

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	78	101	96	88	123	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	19	21	23	18	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	10	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	5	15	8	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63

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	1	1	1	10	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	3	2	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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	63	83	77	74	102	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	63	83	77	74	102	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	499
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	4	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				64%	58%	57%	67%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	59%	58%	58%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	56%	53%	45%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				72%	65%	63%	73%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				58%	65%	62%	63%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	53%	51%	40%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	58%	53%	69%	59%	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	63%	54%	9%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	57%	8%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	58%	16%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	67%	4%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	64%	4%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	65%	53%	12%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading and Math data is from 2020-2021 iReady Diagnostic (Fall, Winter Spring)

Gr. 5 Science data is from 2020-2021 Science 05 PM1, PM2, PM3

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38.85	53.77	64.29
	Economically Disadvantaged	23.84	39.16	47.53
	Students With Disabilities	33.71	48.84	58.62
	English Language Learners	20.83	34.78	34.78
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27.48	43.36	63.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	15.12	29.09	49.07
	Students With Disabilities	31.03	41.67	54.12
	English Language Learners	16.67	34.78	43.48
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38.24	51.01	60.97
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.05	34.23	43.15
	Students With Disabilities	28.42	40.91	52.81
	English Language Learners	22.73	33.33	38.1
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	27.03	42.28	62.63
	Economically Disadvantaged	14.01	27.21	47.18
	Students With Disabilities	27.37	41.57	53.41
	English Language Learners	18.18	38.1	52.38

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46.8	58.72	67.79
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.82	43.1	50.86
	Students With Disabilities	35.42	45.88	55.17
	English Language Learners	15.38	25	25
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	30.12	50.46	69.75
	Economically Disadvantaged	18.6	37.72	57.02
	Students With Disabilities	28.42	47.06	54.12
	English Language Learners	7.69	50	66.67
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54.21	60	67.57
	Economically Disadvantaged	37.11	44.19	51.16
	Students With Disabilities	46.67	51.52	58.82
	English Language Learners	16.67	33.33	33.33
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33.58	53.67	70.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.21	40	56.63
	Students With Disabilities	35.14	53.03	59.09
	English Language Learners	8.33	41.67	58.33

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50.25	54.82	60.51
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.14	38.57	42.03
	Students With Disabilities	45.9	49.12	52.63
	English Language Learners	9.09	36.36	27.27
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38.81	53.57	70.16
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.03	34.78	53.85
	Students With Disabilities	39.04	50.88	54.55
	English Language Learners	9.09	36.36	54.55
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	41.38	46.91	41.38
	Economically Disadvantaged	24.24	28	24.24
	Students With Disabilities	48.28	61.54	48.28
	English Language Learners	33.33	50	33.33
	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	36	50	50	37	35	36	28				
ELL	33			33							
BLK	31			23							
HSP	57	60		53			58				
WHT	70	63	53	65	53	39	54				
FRL	46	46	47	45	35	36	31				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	43	35	46	55	46	44				
ELL	46			77							
BLK	69	60		69	70						
HSP	47	68	57	61	59	38	60				

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
MUL	73			55							
WHT	67	59	44	75	57	44	73				
FRL	44	54	42	55	51	44	44				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	41	51	42	44	47	21	35				
ELL	50	60		61	40						
BLK	45	56		50	38		36				
HSP	64	55	50	66	60		71				
WHT	69	59	45	77	66	39	72				
FRL	48	49	42	56	52	41	39				

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	54
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	64
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	434
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	43
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	
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	27
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	57
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
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 learning gains L25 subgroups is showing a trend with a decrease in proficiency in both ELA and Math.

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

ELA and Math learning gains L25 demonstrate the greatest need based on 2019 FSA state assessments.

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

The L25 learning gain group is a majority of the students in the SWD subgroup, in which students are receiving intensive support in phonics in addition to the core reading instruction. Actions this current year include offering after school tutoring to the specific subgroup.

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

ELA proficiency had the most improvement.

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

Tiered interventions to specifically address deficiencies in the area of phonics in addition to the core reading curriculum. Continued the use of DBQ's to allow for text analysis and text based writing.

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

Implementation of the new ELA curriculum in which all students are working within grade level text using a scaffolded approach. Continuing to address deficiencies in the area of phonics through tiered interventions.

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.

Professional development provided for the new ELA Benchmark Advanced Curriculum & BEST Standards through the district instructional team and pd department.

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

Professional development provided in area of Math and various models for how to solve problems. Professional development provided in area of Science to elevate instruction to the rigor of the standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA 2020-2021 ELA Learning Gains of Lowest 25% subgroup was at 45% proficient, which is a 20% decrease between the overall ELA proficiency and the ELA Learning Gains.

Measurable Outcome: Improve the ELA Learning Gains of Lowest 25% subgroup from 45% proficient to 50% proficient on the 2021-2022 FSA ELA. Each ELA teacher in grades 4 & 5 will increase the proficiency by 5% within the subgroup.

Monitoring: Benchmark Advanced Interim Assessments above 60%; Benchmark Advanced Unit Tests above 60%; SPIRE 90% post data; Foundations Phonics Unit Assessments 80%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: FL Benchmark Advanced ELA Instructional Curriculum and Foundations Phonics Curriculum. SPIRE is utilized for students who need an intensive multi-sensory approach in phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in addition to the core curriculum.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark Advanced ELA Curriculum is the approved adopted instructional materials aligned to the new FL BEST Standards. Foundations Phonics Curriculum is the approved adopted instructional materials. SPIRE is the approved adopted instructional material specifically used for who require the intensive multi-sensory approach in phonemic awareness and phonics instruction in addition to the core curriculum.

Action Steps to Implement

Review student data from benchmark advanced interim assessments and unit assessments including Foundations and SPIRE during PLC's to determine student instructional needs for remediation and enrichment.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Literacy Leadership Team will review school wide data from interim assessments and unit assessments including Foundations and SPIRE to identify instructional and professional development needs.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Conduct classroom walkthroughs to ensure implementation of standards based instruction of the BEST Standards and interventions from data discussions for Grade K-5.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Before or After School Tutoring sessions targeting specific reading skills/strategies.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Reading Incentives using the Book Vending Machine to encourage student reading of books to increase student vocabulary and reading stamina.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: FSA 2020-2021 MATH Learning Gains of Lowest 25% subgroup was at 35% proficient, which is a 30% decrease between the overall MATH proficiency and a 20% decrease in the overall MATH Learning Gains.

Measurable Outcome: Improve the MATH Learning Gains of Lowest 25% subgroup from 35% proficient to 50% proficient on the 2021-2022 FSA MATH. Each Math teacher in grades 4 & 5 will increase the proficiency by 5% within the subgroup.

Monitoring: Math iReady Diagnostic (Fall, Winter, Spring); district Math Common Summative Assessment data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: iReady Diagnostic and Instruction is the approved progress monitoring tool. Go Math is the approved Math adopted curriculum materials.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: iReady Diagnostic and Instruction is the approved progress monitoring tool, which assists with developing the individual student pathway to provide remediation and enrichment. Go Math is the approved Math adopted curriculum materials.

Action Steps to Implement

Review student data from iReady Math Diagnostic and unit assessments during PLC's to determine student instructional needs for remediation and enrichment.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Targeted subgroup of gr. 5 students will have intensive instruction during intervention block to remediate on gr. 3 and gr. 4 fractions standards using the MCSD Fraction Boot Camp curriculum.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Before or After School Tutoring sessions targeting specific math standards & strategies.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	FSA 2020-2021 Science Proficiency was at 53% proficient, which is a 12% decrease from 2018-2019 FSA data.
Measurable Outcome:	Improve the FSA Science Gr. 5 Proficiency from 53% proficient to 60% proficient on the 2021-2022 FSA Science. Each gr. 5 teacher will increase proficiency by 5%.
Monitoring:	Use district provided common summative assessments (CSAs) and Progress Monitoring Tests to monitor student progress from Performance Matters for Grades 3-5
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	FL Pearson Science Instructional Curriculum aligned to FL Science Standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	FL Pearson Science Curriculum is the approved adopted instructional materials aligned to the FL Science Standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify Power (essential) Standards during PLCs with data discussion after completion of each unit and use of interventions to support struggling students or Grades 3-5.

Person Responsible Kerry Soviero (sovierk@martin.k12.fl.us)

Provide support in the integration of science content and nonfiction texts into ELA instruction.

Person Responsible Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Science Lab teacher will focus on vocabulary and hands-on activities of Power (Essential) Standards.

Person Responsible Kim Higgins (higgink@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Attendance was identified based on current trending data where over 20 students in each grade level have attendance identified as an early warning indicator.

Measurable Outcome: Maintain student attendance rate to be between 90-92% at each twenty day student attendance count which includes in person students and students on "placed at home status" that should be completing course assignments to be marked with the "Q" present attendance code.

Monitoring: Review of twenty day student attendance count with a reduction in absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Attendance Works evidence based strategies will be implemented to help educate parents on the importance of regular attendance

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The strong correlation between consistent attendance and reading proficiency is the rationale for selecting the strategy. Many of the students in the L25 learning gain subgroups typically trend with high absenteeism.

Action Steps to Implement

Attendance /Early Warning Systems reports generated from Student Services to determine attendance concerns/patterns of absences.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

School based team (teacher, administrator) makes contact with parents via letter and phone call to discuss concerns.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

MTSS team meets with parents if more than 5 unexcused absences and a pattern is occurring. Initiate support from School Social Worker and/or District Attendance Officer to assist with home visits and MTSS meetings as needed.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

Attendance Incentives, including the Book Vending Machine & PBIS rewards will be utilized for group and individual to meet attendance goals.

Person Responsible Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Emotional Learning strategies was identified as a critical need based on the 2020-2021 Teacher Satisfaction & Engagement Surveys in which teachers indicated a need for additional behavioral interventions/tools to support students with self-regulation and de-escalation during pre-crisis, crisis, and post crisis situations.

Measurable Outcome: A 3% reduction in referrals, out of school suspensions, and restraints.

Monitoring: FOCUS Discipline Report, attendance reports, restraints report to FLDOE

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will learn self-regulation skills through grade level appropriate lessons from the district approved SEL curriculum Sanford Harmony and/or Zones of Regulations during daily SEL block. SEL skills taught include growth mindset, de-escalation/calming strategies, and mindfulness strategies are important to assist students in being able to access learning. SEL is a district and school-wide initiative.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative Practices and Sanford Harmony SEL Program were adopted as the district wide SEL initiatives/programs to be utilized in K-12. Zones of Regulation was implemented through the MCSD ESE Department for students who have social skills on their IEP.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development provided to full staff by the ESE Behavior Team on verbal de-escalation strategies utilized through Crisis Intervention Program (CPI) and Crisis Plans to support students during behavioral crisis situations.

Person Responsible: Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

Professional Development throughout the year to full staff by the district PBIS Coach on implementing PBIS tiered behavioral supports with a focus on trauma informed care.

Person Responsible: Michael McLeod (mcleodm@martin.k12.fl.us)

MTSS Behavior problem solving to implement behavior strategies with tiered supports.

Person Responsible: Deborah Riley (rileyd@martin.k12.fl.us)

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.

Based on data, the primary area of concern to be monitored is the out of school suspensions and violent incidents. Professional Development has been provided to full staff by the ESE Behavior Team on verbal de-escalation strategies utilized through Crisis Intervention Program (CPI) and Crisis Plans to support students during behavioral crisis situations. A reduction in referrals and physical restraints will be monitored as a focus goal.

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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture for all stakeholders through PBIS activities & events, school-wide spirit days, and a general positive community that is evident in how students and staff interact together on campus. Collaboration among students in the classroom supports student learning. Teachers collaborate on a weekly basis regarding instructional planning. As a school community, one of the primary focus is centered around Social Emotional Learning (SEL). There is a school wide dedicated SEL block each day in which classroom meetings and community building activities are conducted. SEL items are shared in the monthly parent newsletter to support parents with strategies as well. The FAWE vision: Every Student, Every Day is achieved by teachers working together to meet the individual academic and behavior needs of students. The FAWE SAC and PTA work together to provide support needed to help achieve the school goals. Our student clubs are partner together as well as to implement our FAWE Mission: Empowerment Through Community by partnering with local organizations such as Elevate Hope to raise funds and donate food items for the food pantry, which serves many of our families in the community. As well, we participate as in the Sandy Hook Promise "Start With Hello Week" each year to promote an inclusive school culture. The FAWE school community supports students in need by providing weekly food bags in partnership with the Elks Club and local organizations. We have a strong volunteer base of past students who come back to volunteer in classrooms and adults who volunteer at various school-wide events and classroom activities. We have earned the Golden School Awards for volunteer hours. We connect with local organizations through the Jensen Beach Chamber Education Board and the Education Foundation of Martin County to provide experiences for students to enhance their learning, such as Junior Achievement programs which teach students

entrepreneurship. The relationships that are built with community members, local businesses, and families help support and keep the vision and mission of Felix A. Williams Elementary at the forefront of what we do for students on a daily basis.

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

- FAWE PBIS Team- each grade level has a representative to review school wide discipline data and plan school-wide PBIS events
- FAWE PTA- coordinates volunteers, supports student needs for academic and SEL needs
- FAWE SAC- reviews satisfaction & engagement survey results to plan for areas of improvement

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$6,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	School Improvement Funds		\$1,000.00
			<i>Notes: SPIRE Student Materials; Benchmark Advanced Materials; Foundations Grade Level Student Materials; books purchased for the Book Vending Machine</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	Other Federal		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Tutoring funds</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				\$5,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Math Instructional Materials for Students as needed to support math standards and intervention needs.</i>			
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	Other Federal		\$5,000.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	School Improvement Funds		\$500.00
			<i>Notes: Science Materials as needed for hands-on learning activities</i>			
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$386.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22

			0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	School Improvement Funds		\$386.00
			<i>Notes: Student Attendance Incentives including books purchased for the book vending machine</i>			
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$386.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
			0341 - Felix A Williams Elem School	School Improvement Funds		\$386.00
			<i>Notes: Self-Regulation materials/tools as needed for students.</i>			
					Total:	\$12,772.00