

Manatee County Public Schools

Samoset Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Samoset Elementary School

3300 19TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

<http://www.edline.net/pages/sdmcsamosetes>

Demographics

Principal: Maribeth Mason

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Samoset Elementary School’s mission is to create an engaging, positive environment that provides high quality instruction and leadership opportunities to students so that they will strive to achieve their individual academic and personal goals.

Provide the school's vision statement

Inspiring all students to achieve their personal best, both in the classroom and in the 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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Mason, Maribeth	Principal	Facilitate Leadership Teams Facilitate Collaborative Planning Facilitate Student Data- Academic and Behavioral
Hankerson, Fabian	Other	PBIS and student behavior systems
O'Kelly, Stephanie	Instructional Coach	Coaching of primary teachers in reading School Literacy Team School Leadership Team
Fanning, Nuris	Teacher, K-12	ELL servicing - resource teaching, parent communication, compliance
Rodgers, Ciara	Teacher, K-12	RTI/ MTSS systems Intervention groups
Colborn, Sabrina	Guidance Counselor	MTSS/ RTI counseling services
Marshall, Beth	Assistant Principal	Facilitate Leadership Teams Facilitate Collaborative Planning Facilitate Student Data- Academic and Behavioral

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Maribeth Mason

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.*

3

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

28

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (37%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	66	85	104	118	83	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	5	10	6	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	2	17	20	36	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Course failure in Math	2	17	20	36	20	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	13	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	0	8	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/3/2020

Prior Year - 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	82	113	97	94	86	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	8	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	3	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - 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	82	113	97	94	86	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	17	8	5	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	14	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	3	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	34%	52%	57%	28%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	57%	58%	36%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	55%	53%	32%	47%	48%
Math Achievement	53%	63%	63%	42%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains	75%	68%	62%	55%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	53%	51%	46%	47%	47%
Science Achievement	23%	48%	53%	23%	49%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	30%	51%	-21%	58%	-28%
	2018	25%	49%	-24%	57%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	56%	-15%	58%	-17%
	2018	26%	51%	-25%	56%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	29%	52%	-23%	56%	-27%
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	60%	-19%	62%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	37%	56%	-19%	62%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	65%	-2%	64%	-1%
	2018	40%	61%	-21%	62%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		26%				
05	2019	55%	60%	-5%	60%	-5%
	2018	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	22%	48%	-26%	53%	-31%
	2018	23%	49%	-26%	55%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	70	76	29	75	70					
ELL	30	60	70	53	80	74	25				
BLK	20	59	69	31	68	58					
HSP	36	59	65	57	79	77	31				
WHT	46	57		68	62		10				
FRL	34	59	71	53	74	65	20				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	7	23	16	17	40	38					
ELL	16	30	33	31	56	59	3				
BLK	23	30	40	37	40	8	15				
HSP	29	39	31	41	55	55	23				
WHT	33	27		59	78		33				
FRL	28	36	29	42	56	48	23				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
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
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Our lowest performing area is Science. Our Science proficiency scores have been in the low 20s for the past few years. Our Reading and Math achievement has steadily increased the last three years, yet our Science proficiency has not.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

The Science data declined by 1% this school year. Our school focused heavily on Reading and Math this year to improve our school grade. Due to this focused instruction, there are gaps in Science content, and our students did not do well on the assessment.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

The greatest gap at Samoset compared to the state average are the proficiency achievement categories. Samoset is 23% below the state Reading score, 19% below the state in Math, and 30% lower than the state in Science. As a Title 1 school, we have struggled with proficiency. Our scores increased this year, but still did not make the state average. ELA proficiency has improved 5% and Math proficiency has improved 11% over last year.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

As a school, all of our data improved last year, except in Science which stayed almost the same (-1). Our greatest increases were in Reading and Math learning gains. ELA learning gains increased by 22%, ELA L25 increased by 34%, our Math learning gains increased by 20% and our Math L25 gains increased by 24%. Our school followed the state recommended guidelines for common board configuration, implemented weekly data meetings with teachers, utilized regular coaching cycles, and followed the district curriculum plan with fidelity. We feel that these actions contributed to our gains.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One great concern is our primary grades, and the fact that students come to us having not attended PreK programs. There is little to no school readiness when students arrive for Kindergarten. Many students in our population are second language learners. We work to provide them support necessary to be successful in school. In reviewing the data, the trends at Samoset show that students who leave kindergarten on grade level, remain on grade level. We are closing the gap, but not quickly enough.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Achievement in reading, math and science
2. Learning gains in reading and math
3. Science proficiency
4. Decrease in behavioral incidents
5. Lower suspension rates

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The greatest gap at Samoset is the achievement categories. Samoset is 23% below the state in reading, 10% below the state in math, and 30% lower than the state in science. As a title 1 school, we have struggled with proficiency. Our scores increased this year, but still did not make the state average. ELA proficiency has improve 5% Math proficiency has improved 11% last year.

Measureable Outcome: Samoset students will increase ELA proficiency by 8% this school year. Math proficiency by 10% as measured by the 2021 ELA/Math FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maribeth Mason (masonm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Common Formative assessments/tasks- This includes a focus on the power standards across a unit and daily essential questions for our common board configuration and weekly writing tasks across content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Regular and timely feedback regarding student attainment of most critical standards, which allows teachers to modify instruction to better meet the diverse learning needs of all students.
2. Multiple-measure assessments that allow students to demonstrate their understanding in a variety of formats.
3. Ongoing collaboration opportunities for grade-level, course, and department teachers.
4. Consistent expectations within a grade level, course, and department regarding standards, instruction, and assessment priorities.
5. Agreed-upon criteria for proficiency to be met within each individual classroom, grade level, school, and district.
6. Deliberate alignment of classroom, school, district, and state assessments to better prepare students for success on state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common board configuration used to explain standards
2. Daily EQ will lead students to the culminating standard at the end of the week
3. Learning progressions are used for students and teachers to assess students' learning through out the week to decide next steps in teaching
4. Students are assessed and teachers collaborate to tabulate students' proficiency
5. Teams look for success, and struggles from classes.
6. Teams decide on next steps in teaching after students are categorized as proficient, approaching, or remediation.
7. During collaborative planning teams differentiate instruction for small groups. Groups are formed after data is analyzed.

Person Responsible Beth Marshall (marshallb@manateeschools.net)

Common planning will be used by grade-level teachers to implement standards based lesson plans.

1. Teachers will plan collaboratively around reading and math weekly.
2. eLearning teachers will collaborate to implement effective eLearning lessons for students in grades K-5
3. Action step number one will be planned and carried out through the use of collaboration by teacher grade-level groups.

4. Grade-level teams will meet biweekly with administration to discuss student data points and next steps towards standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Maribeth Mason (masonm@manateeschools.net)

Samoset is becoming a Cambridge School Magnet. Part of this process is accelerated learning in the academic areas of reading, writing, and mathematics.

1. Students will be grouped according to ability.
2. A rigorous instructional model will be implemented to enhance the standards based curriculum
3. Teachers will embed standards based questions in core content areas as well as during social studies and science blocks.
4. Teachers will use writing to enhance student's comprehension skills as they will require text-based responses to reading material.

Person Responsible Maria Lehman (lehmanm@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA learning gains increased by 22%, ELA L25 increased by 34%, our Math learning gains increased by 20% and our Math L25 gains increased by 24%. Samoset is closing the achievement gap, but not quickly enough. Samoset needs to continue the learning gains to bring students closer to proficiency in reading and math.

Measureable Outcome: Our goal is to increase learning gains in ELA by 13% and to increase our math by 1 %. Making ELA learning gains to 71% and Math learning gains to 76% as measured by the 2021 ELA/Math FSA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maribeth Mason (masonm@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Small group differentiation
Teachers who use differentiated instruction tailor their teaching approach to match their students learning styles and ability levels.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Instead of a one size fits all mentality our teachers differentiate instruction using a variety of methods. This can include teaching in small groups or in one-on-one sessions. Carol Ann Tomlinson, an educator has done some of the most innovative work in this area. The four areas of differentiation are Content, Process, Projects and Learning Environment.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers differentiate instruction during core reading and math
2. Students participate in differentiated reading instruction during extended day. Students will be using SRA, Reading mastery, and Mindplay, and LAFS.
3. Tier three students (all students who are two or more grade levels below their current grade level) will have an extra thirty minutes of reading instruction outside the core reading and extended day using Fontas and Panelle LLI in intermediate grades and Literacy Footprints in primary grades

Person Responsible Maribeth Mason (masonm@manateeschools.net)

ELL students will receive extra services in all grade levels either by an ELL resource teacher or ELL paraprofessional. Academic vocabulary will be the area of focus. Students will receive push in support by an ELL resource teacher and para professionals. Students will use a content home language dictionary to assist during learning times. Third through fifth grade students who are LY and LF will participate in after school ELL tutoring beginning on November 1st.

Person Responsible Nuris Fanning (fanningn@manateeschools.net)

ESE students who are mainstreamed into general education classes will receive extra support during extended day and math club time. Groups will be small and students will receive targeted instruction that fill the gaps between the core content and their ability levels. IEP accommodations will be used daily in the classroom.

Person Responsible Sabrina Colborn (colborns@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The science data declined by 1%. Science data should at least correlate to the reading proficiency level in 5th grade.

Measureable Outcome: Science scores will increase by 10% in 5th grade as measured by the 2021 FSSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie O'Kelly (okelly2s@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: After-school tutoring
Saturday School

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: An extension of the school day with hands on activities for students will increase understanding of the science concepts learned daily in the classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Vocabulary building activities for students to increase understanding of science concepts learned in the classrooms.
2. Hands on lab experiences
3. Computer based skills
4. STEM class
5. Acaletics science quikpiks
6. Fine Arts classes will front load science academic terms daily

Person Responsible Fabian Hankerson (hankersonf@manateeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Social Emotional Learning
Description and Rationale: State of Florida Law: Section 1. Social Emotional Learning: Foundations for Success is an Appropriations Project as defined in The Rules of The Florida House of Representatives and is described in Appropriations Project Request 1591, herein incorporated by reference.

Measureable Outcome: Students will demonstrate their ability to keep their emotions under control by spending less time in the office. Office referrals will decrease from last year by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Fabian Hankerson (hankersonf@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students will participate in SEL lessons using the program Character Strong. This is a research based program meant to increase student's ability to demonstrate positive character traits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults understand and. manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain. positive relationships, and make. responsible decisions

Action Steps to Implement

1. Conduct 1 lesson per month per class
2. Common school-wide expectations for character traits
3. Newsletter to parents

Person Responsible Sabrina Colborn (colborns@manateeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher book study- Clarity for Learning- Five Essential Practices that Empower Students and Teachers Both teachers and students are clear on learning objectives , curriculum resources, feedback and assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Teachers will plan lessons and chart the learning progression of students monthly by using common assessments on the district power standards in reading and math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie O'Kelly (okelly2s@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Book study- monthly meeting and book talks that demonstrate teacher understanding through lesson plans and assessment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Clarity for learning connects all aspects of the learning environment.

Action Steps to Implement

Cambridge School Magnet Implementation- professional development that is on-line for the entire staff on Cambridge Global Studies.

Person Responsible Beth Marshall (marshallb@manateeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Samoset is working to improve our student engagement by decreasing the number of students who are out of class due to behavioral issues. Our Tier 1 goals are to provide multiple opportunities for students to change behavior, get back on track and learn in the classroom. Our Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be monitored by our intervention team and data will be collected and shared with teachers on a monthly basis. Samoset will also be working with the Patterson Foundation to increase daily attendance for our students.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Samoset Elementary School believes in involving parents in all aspects of their child's education. Our parents have the responsibility for developing, implementing and evaluating the various school level plans, including the SIP and PFEP. Parent workshops, which function as our PTO, are extremely active in all school planning. In addition, parent meetings are held to discuss and carefully deliberate changes that are needed to the PFEP. All parents are given the opportunity to review the plan and offer input prior to approval. For the PFEP evaluation, parents were given surveys at the end of the school year seeking their input on activities, trainings and materials they need to help their child. Results of the parent surveys are reviewed to determine needed changes. The survey results are also reviewed and discussed with parent workshop groups. Parent workshop groups are offered to increase parent awareness and involvement. Surveys are given to determine needed changes and additional resources for parents. During the SAC meeting when the PFEP is developed, the committee will take input from the parents in attendance to determine how the parental involvement funds will be used. "Pastries and Parents" is an event used to review all SAC items related to school improvement. We will use our Connect Ed telephone system to communicate about meetings to discuss the planning and review of our programs. We will also use student agendas and personal invitations to make parents aware of involvement opportunities. We will utilize our Home School Parent Liaison to facilitate bi-monthly meetings with our parent community that focus on providing academic support and family/community resources. Then the principal and SAC members decide how to use the Title 1 funds, how to best meet the needs of students.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------