Manatee County Public Schools

# Anna Maria Elementary School


## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

# Anna Maria Elementary School

4700 GULF DR, Holmes Beach, FL 34217

https://www.manateeschools.net/annamaria

## Demographics

### Principal: Michael Masiello

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | No |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 38% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: A (71%)<br>2018-19: A (66%)<br>2017-18: 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** | ATSI |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

# Table of Contents

# Anna Maria Elementary School

4700 GULF DR, Holmes Beach, FL 34217

https://www.manateeschools.net/annamaria

## School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School KG-5 | No | 38% |

| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 15% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | A | | A | A |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

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

Growing together as we plant seeds to learn, dream and succeed; "We strive to support student experiences that will provide them the tools to be successful individuals and members of our community."

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

To become a community of learners that celebrates our differences and embraces our future.

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Masiello, Mike | Principal | Serves as curriculum leader<br>a. Serves on the School Data Team<br>b. Coordinate activities with team members to facilitate the implementation of content area performance standards, instructional objectives and interdisciplinary planning units<br>c. Oversees District and State Assessment processes<br>d. MTSS Team member, ILT Chair, Literacy Leadership Team member<br>e. Oversees, coordinates, and monitors the implementation of best practices for inclusive education for all SWDs<br>f. Provides support for students and parents in all aspects of the school environment to promote a positive school environment and academic achievement |
| Sherburne, Kim | School Counselor | a. Coordinator Caring School Community and responsible for implementation and teacher training.<br>b. Serve as Data Team Member<br>d.. 504 coordinator<br>e. IST/MTSS coordinator<br>f. Testing Coordinator<br>g. Guidance Counselor |
| Graham, Ivory | Dean | a. Discipline<br>b. CHAMPS/SPARK Chair Person<br>c. Serve on MTSS/ILT Team. |
| Davis, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12 | a. 5th Grade Teacher<br>b. Serves on the Instructional Leadership Team<br>Literacy Leadership Team Model Classroom Teacher 3-5<br>c. 3rd-5th Team Leader |
| Buff, Pamela | Teacher, K-12 | a. 3rd Grade Teacher and serves on the Instructional Leadership Team<br>b. BEST Standards ELA Champion<br>c. Literacy Leadership Team |
| Redeker, Laura | Teacher, K-12 | a. 2nd Grade Teacher<br>b. Serves on the Instructional Leadership Team |
| McIntosh, Beth | Teacher, ESE | a. ESE Teacher and ESE Team Leader, serves on the<br>b. Instructional Leadership Team |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| O'Neill, Nicole | Teacher, K-12 | a. 4th Grade Teacher<br>b. Serves on the Instructional Leadership Team<br>c. BEST Standards Math Champion |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, Michael Masiello

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

7

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

11

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

188

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

0

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

0

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 31 | 29 | 36 | 18 | 33 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 186 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 13 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Saturday 8/27/2022

**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 | 28 | 31 | 21 | 39 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 28 | 31 | 21 | 39 | 34 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 78% | 55% | 56% | | | | 75% | 52% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 66% | | | | | | 62% | 57% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | | | | | | 58% | 55% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 78% | 50% | 50% | | | | 85% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 81% | | | | | | 68% | 68% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | | | | | | 55% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 85% | 65% | 59% | | | | 60% | 48% | 53% |

**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** |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 51% | 18% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 56% | 24% | 58% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 52% | 22% | 56% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -80% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 88% | 60% | 28% | 62% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 90% | 65% | 25% | 64% | 26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -88% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 77% | 60% | 17% | 60% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -90% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 48% | 11% | 53% | 6% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 42 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 67 | 46 | 78 | 79 | 58 | 83 | | | | |
| FRL | 71 | 67 | | 65 | 78 | | | | | | |
| **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 | 62 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 59 | | 78 | 75 | | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 71 | 50 | | 67 | | | 36 | | | | |
| **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 | 44 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 78 | 66 | 67 | 86 | 77 | 63 | 58 | | | | |
| FRL | 65 | 47 | 50 | 80 | 70 | | 67 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 71 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 495 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Black/African American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Pacific Islander Students** | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |

| 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% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 70 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 70 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**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?**

Overall, ELA achievement in grades 3-5 stayed the same from 2021 to 2022 at 78%.
Overall, ELA learning gains increased from 59% in 2021 to 66% in 2022.
Overall Math achievement in grades 3-5 increased from 77% in 2021 to 78% in 2022.
Math learning gains for 3rd-5th grade increased from 73% in 2021 to 81% in 2022
Science achievement increased from 63% in 2021 to 85% during 2022
Third grade ELA achievement decreased from 86% in 2021 to 70% in 2022
Third grade Math achievement decreased from 75% in 2021 to 68% in 2022
Students with Disabilities ELA achievement decreased from 62% to 42% in 2022
Students with Disabilities Math achievement decreased from 38% to 33% in 2022

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

In grades 3-5 overall ELA remained the same at 78% from 2021 to 2022. Math increased by one percent from a 77% in 2021 to at 78% in 2022.
Third grade ELA and Math FSA achievement demonstrated a need for improvement along with SWD.

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

Students entered school with some gaps in foundational reading and math skills which impacted ELA and math acheivement We made growth in 2022 to help close the gap, our learning gains have gone up in both Math and ELA from the previous year.
In order to increase acheivement in Math students in grades 2-5 will receive an additional 30 minutes of instruction in math utilizing Acaletics spiral review.
Refine elementary instructional model to provide time as needed to practice and master literacy sub-

skills such as phonics, fluency, and vocabulary. To increase proficiency in ELA, students will receive an additional 60 minutes of instruction during the school day to address deficiencies and or accelerate learning. After school tutoring will be provided for students in grades 1-5 using ESSER funds.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Overall, ELA learning gains in grades 3-5, overall Math learning gains and Science achievement showed the most improvement.

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

Students identified as having skill deficits were provided with intensive intervention and remediation in reading and math. Science vocabulary was a focus throughout the year and reinforced in STEM Lab, spaced practice strategy was utilized, Woz Ed curriculum was utilized, Acaletics Math was used in 4th and 5th grade. Students were able to collaborate more by working in groups and by having face to face instruction for all students.

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

Acaletics supplemental Math curriculum offers a standard based spiral review which will be implemented daily in grades 2-5, students will be assessed monthly on progress towards mastering math standards and skills retaught as needed. Students in all grade levels are scheduled for an additional 30 minutes of math instruction per day. WOZ Science kits will be utilized in 4th and 5th grade to reinforce science standards, Nature of Science Standards are brought to life through hands-on learning experiences.
All students in grades k-5 will engage in hands on learning during STEM Lab .
Schedule additional 60 minutes of ELA instruction to provide Accelerated ELA component to see success for those students who need it. Increase enrollments in accelerated courses and identification of gifted and talented students.
Hands on learning activities focused around Marine Science and Art will be implemented in all grade levels utilizing curriculum designed by The Guy Harvey Ocean Foundation and aligned to State Standards.

**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.**

Teachers in grades 2-5 including administration will be provided professional development, lesson modeling and data review from the Acaletics representative. Teachers in 3rd and 4th grade will be provided professional development on the Accelerated Envision Math books. Teachers in 4th and 5th grade will be provided professional development around utilization of WOZ Ed Science kits. Teachers in all grades will be provided professional development on the Guy Harvey science curriculum to support more hands-on learning. Teachers in 3rd-5th will be provided professional development on accelerated component in the classroom for ELA.

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

Additional services include utilizing ESSER lll funds to make up learning loss in grades 1-5 by offering after school tutoring. Millage funds will be utilized to support STEAM initiatives with conducting estuary studies at all grade levels to provide hands on learning around Science.

**Areas of Focus**
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

**:**

| #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Students with Disabilities ELA achievement decreased from 62% to 42% during 2021-2022 |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By May, 2023 60% of SWD in grades 3-5 will score at a proficient level on the ELA F.A.S.T. assessment . |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Students will be progress monitored using STAR/CBM in grades k-2 and using DIBELS for grades 3-5. Students will also be monitoried using the F.A.S.T. assessment and district benchmark assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | 1. Struggling students in grades 1-5 will receive additional after school tutoring in reading and math.<br>2. Teachers will plan Collaboratively to analyze student work and craft lesson plans for remediation and acceleration.<br>3. Classroom based interventions utilizing SIPPS, K-5 - Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words, Benchmark Advanced Differentiated lessons, Literacy Footprints Grade Level Kit, IReady lessons. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | * SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words): The SIPPS program has a moderate rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.<br>* Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 Lessons: This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.<br>*Literacy Footprints Grade Level/Intervention Partner Kit: Does not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence, however three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade IES Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence. |

* Struggling students need additional targeted instruction in reading to fill gaps in learning. After school tutoring will be offered to students in grades 1-5 who demonstrate a reading deficiency.

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Students in grades 3-5 with reading deficits will be identified using progress monitoring data and invited to participate in after school tutoring. 2. Teachers will utilize SIPPS, Benchmark Advanced Differentiated lessons, Iready lessons in order to provide intervention to struggling readers.

**Person Responsible** Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net)

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Students with Disabilities Math achievement decreased from 38% to 33% during 2021-2022 |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By May, 2023 60% of SWD in grades 3-5 will score at a proficient level on the Math F.A.S.T. assessment . |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Students will be monitoried using the F.A.S.T. Assessment, District Benchmark Assessments and monthly Acaletics assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | Implement Acaletics Math in grades 2-5 and provide additional 30 minutes of math instruction in all grade levels. Differentiated instruction for struggling students and students in need of acceleration will be provided.<br>Provide after school tutoring for students identified as struggling in math. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Acaletics offers students multiple exposures to math problems based on Florida State Standards and provides corrective feedback from the teacher to target misconceptions students have. Multiple exposures provide students with multiple opportunities to encounter, engage with, and elaborate on new knowledge and skills. Research demonstrates deep learning develops over time via multiple, spaced interactions with new knowledge and concepts. This may require spacing practice over several days, and using different activities to vary the interactions learners have with new knowledge. Related effect sizes ; Time on task – 0.62, Spaced practice – 0.71, Feedback – 0.73. (Hattie, Lemov, Marzano, and the Teaching and Learning Toolkit – Australia (Education Endowment Foundation, 2015) Acaletics reinforces motivation with opportunities for students to achieve monthly goals with participate in monthly incentives. Differentiated teaching refers to methods teachers use to extend the knowledge and skills of every student in every class, regardless of their starting point. The objective is to lift the performance of all students, including those who are falling behind and those ahead of year level expectations. Response to Intervention (RTI) combines highly tailored differentiation with evidence-based interventions which are constantly (RTI is also known as Multi-Tier System of Supports). Research shows a remarkable effect size of 1.07 for RTI (Hattie (2012) Small group instruction has an effect size of 0.49 on student learning when the groups are flexible instead of fixed, and are formed based on data that points to student need (Fisher, Frey, and Hattie, 2016). |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers in 2nd-5th grade will be provided professional development in using Acaletics. Students will practice a spiral review of math standards daily for an additional 30 minutes using Acaletics Math, students will test monthly to determine progress on state standards. Teachers in all grade levels will provide an additional 30 minutes of math instruction and small group differentiated instruction in Math. Students who need an accelerated format in math in grades 3 and 4 will be placed in a group that will expose them to some standards in the next grade level.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Third grade ELA achievement decreased from 86% in 2021 to 70% in 2022 |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By May, 2023 83% of 3rd grade students will score proficient on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.<br>By May, 2023 82% of 4th grade students will score proficient on the F.A.S.T. Assessment.<br>By May, 2023 82% of 5th grade students will score proficient on the F.A.S.T. Assessment. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Students will be monitoried using the F.A.S.T. assessment and district benchmark assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | 1. Struggling students in grades 1-5 will receive additional after school tutoring in reading and math.<br>2. Teachers will plan Collaboratively to analyze student work and craft lesson plans for remediation and acceleration.<br>3. Classroom based interventions utilizing SIPPS, K-5 - Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words, Benchmark Advanced Differentiated lessons, Literacy Footprints Grade Level Kit, IReady lessons.<br>4. In addition to the 90-minute ELA block, ELA acceleration will be provided for eligible students in grades 3-5. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | * SIPPS (Systematic Instruction in Phonological Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words): The SIPPS program has a moderate rating on the Evidence for ESSA website.<br>* Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 Lessons: This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.<br>*Literacy Footprints Grade Level/Intervention Partner Kit: Does not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence, however three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade IES Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. |

Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence.
* Struggling students need additional targeted instruction in reading to fill gaps in learning. After school tutoring will be offered to students in grades 1-5 who demonstrate a reading deficiency.
*The goal of acceleration is to tailor the level and complexity of the curriculum to the ability and academic readiness of students.

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Students in grades 3-5 with reading deficits will be identified using progress monitoring data and invited to participate in after school tutoring. 2. Teachers will utilize SIPPS, Benchmark Advanced Differentiated lessons, Iready lessons in order to provide intervention to struggling readers. 4. Placement decisions for accelerated programs are made in careful review of student performance data from a variety of sources, such as F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring, District Benchmark Assessment, and adaptive diagnostics.

**Person Responsible** Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net)

| #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Third grade Math achievement decreased from 75% in 2021 to 68% during in 2022 |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By May, 2023 83% of 3rd grade students will score proficient on the F.A.S.T. Math Assessment.<br>By May, 2023 85% of 4th grade students will score proficient on the F.A.S.T. Math Assessment.<br>By May, 2023 87% of 5th grade students will score proficient on the F.A.S.T. Math Assessment. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Students will be monitoried using the F.A.S.T. Assessment, District Benchmark Assessments and monthly Acaletics assessments. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | 1. Implement Acaletics Math in grades 2-5 and provide additional 30 minutes of math instruction in all grade levels.<br>2. Differentiated instruction for struggling students and students in need of acceleration will be provided.<br>Provide after school tutoring for students identified as struggling in math. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | 1. Acaletics offers students multiple exposures to math problems based on Florida State Standards and provides corrective feedback from the teacher to target misconceptions students have. Multiple exposures provide students with multiple opportunities to encounter, engage with, and elaborate on new knowledge and skills. Research demonstrates deep learning develops over time via multiple, spaced interactions with new knowledge and concepts. This may require spacing practice over several days, and using different activities to vary the interactions learners have with new knowledge. Related effect sizes ; Time on task – 0.62, Spaced practice – 0.71, Feedback – 0.73. (Hattie, Lemov, Marzano, and the Teaching and Learning Toolkit – Australia (Education Endowment Foundation, 2015) Acaletics reinforces motivation with opportunities for students to achieve monthly goals with participate in monthly incentives.<br>2. Differentiated teaching refers to methods teachers use to extend the knowledge and skills of every student in every class, regardless of their starting point. The objective is to lift the performance of all students, including those who are falling behind and those ahead of year level expectations. Response to Intervention (RTI) combines highly tailored differentiation with evidence-based interventions which are constantly (RTI is also known as Multi-Tier System of Supports). Research shows a remarkable effect size of 1.07 for RTI (Hattie (2012) Small group instruction has an effect size of 0.49 on student learning when the groups are flexible instead of fixed, and are formed based on data that points to student need (Fisher, Frey, and Hattie, 2016). |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers in 2nd-5th grade will be provided professional development in using Acaletics. Students will practice a spiral review of math standards daily for an additional 30 minutes using Acaletics Math, students will test monthly to determine progress on state standards.
Teachers in all grade levels will provide an additional 30 minutes of math instruction and small group differentiated instruction in Math.
Students who need an accelerated format in math in grades 3 and 4 will be placed in a group that will expose them to some standards in the next grade level.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |

| #5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Students in all grade levels continue to need to build on Science vocabulary and Science concepts previously learned in order to be successful in mastering Science content leading up to 5th grade. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | By May 2023, 5th grade state science achievement scores will increase to 86%. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | District Benchmark Assessments, State Science Assessment |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | 1. To increase Science vocabulary and through "spaced practice" learning strategy, which will increase retention<br>of previously taught science standards<br>2. Utilize Woz Science Curriculum kits in 4th and 5th grade<br>3. Increase student engagement around life science by providing hands on learning experiences with<br>enrichment programs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | 1. Professor John Hattie, developed quantitative values for influences that relate to learning outcomes. He found the average effect size to be 0.40.<br>According to his barometer, "spaced practice" has an effect size of 0.60.<br>2. Woz ED specializes in the development of units of study that allow students to develop an engineering mindset. These turnkey units were written for the science standards and can immediately be implemented in the classroom. The Next Generation Sunshine State Science Standards require more hands-on, project-based experiences for students tograsp concepts. The standards call for students to form hypotheses, test theories, and analyze data.<br>3. Professor John Hattie, author of Visible Learning, and researcher of educational practices, developed quantitative values for influences that relate to learning outcomes. He found the average effect size to be 0.40.<br>According to his barometer, "enrichment programs " has an effect size of 0.39. |

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers will use "spaced practice" strategy
2. The Woz Ed Curriculum will be implemented in 4th and 5th grade classrooms and STEM Lab
3. Conduct Estuary Studies to increase engagement in life science with hands on learning activities

**Person Responsible** Mike Masiello (masiellm@manateeschools.net)

**#6. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

**Measurable Outcome:**
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

**Monitoring:**
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

**Action Steps to Implement**
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

At Anna Maria Elementary we believe that communication and collaboration is the key to building a supportive and appreciative environment in which to work and learn. Our goal is to involve all stakeholders in data driven decision-making to benefit the school as a whole. Our staff was invited to volunteer to assist in the writing of our School Improvement Plan. All staff are involved in the implementation of the plan. Professional Development for all of our staff is available through Schoology this year to meet the challenges of meeting the needs of all staff virtually and in person. Teachers will write their PDP goals to align with our SIP goals.

Each year we hold elections for our SAC board and have always in the past had well attended SAC meetings.They bring the perspectives and viewpoints to our SAC meetings so that as a school community we are able to work together to solve issues and concerns. Our SAC will also be involved in the approval of the SIP for our school. Our PTO is also involved in ensuring the successful implementation of our SIP through raising funds to purchase necessary supplements to our curriculum and learning environment. PTO organizes many events for parents to stay involved with the school community.
We strive to provide timely communication to our staff of current trends using both qualitative and quantitative data. Our culture is one of collaboration and trust. The Instructional Leadership Team meets monthly to analyze student progress monitoring data and trends and works with the MTSS Team to insure all student needs are met.
Grade level teachers collaborate to review current academic data and discuss interventions to meet the individual needs of students.
This year we began the implementation of SPARK, our districtwide commitment to building strong culture and climate in our schools and “spark” engagement and (ultimately) student success. It is not an acronym. It is a series of trainings and process improvements that the district is putting into place to impact our broader MTSS structures, implementation, follow-up, and support. SPARK will include a variety of trainings for staff and strategies to increase student interest, on-task behavior, excitement, and achievement:

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

The Student Support Specialist provides ongoing support for all students needing behavioral intervention in order to be successful in school.
The Guidance Counselor provides counseling services and provides positive life skills lessons for students.
The PTO organizes events for the school community to attend , celebrates staff members, and provides funds for supplemental curricular resources.
SAC meets four times per year for updates and to provide input into the schools current plan.
The School Resource Officer provides security for the campus and interacts in a positive manner with students, staff and families.