Manatee Academy K 8

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Manatee Academy K 8

1450 SW HEATHERWOOD BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/man/

Demographics

Principal: Kerri Walukiewicz

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	67%
2021-22 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (61%)
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	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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

Manatee Academy K 8

1450 SW HEATHERWOOD BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/man/

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)
Combination School KG-8	Yes	67%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	69%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/11/2022.

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 Manatee Academy is to ensure all students graduate from a safe and caring school, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and desire to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Academy, in partnership with parents and community, will become a premier center of knowledge that emphasizes organized around students and the work provided to them. Manatee Academy's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each student, every day. This is the St. Lucie Way!

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
Sullivan, Lisa	Principal	
Piscopo, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Gascoigne, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
Benulis, Kara	Dean	
Biss, Mark	Dean	
Vandegrift, Samantha		
Rosado, Cassie		
Navaretta, Jennifer		
Jerome, Janet	School Counselor	
Montoya, Dawn	School Counselor	
Taylor, Amy		
James, Kirsten	Assistant Principal	
Davis, Chad	Reading Coach	
Ankrom, Ashley	Math Coach	
Cox, Donald	Other	
Herrera, Vanessa	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/25/2022, Kerri Walukiewicz

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.*

7

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.*

34

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

113

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,632

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

19

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

28

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	109	113	150	147	148	175	230	246	254	0	0	0	0	1572
Attendance below 90 percent	42	37	50	33	31	43	66	82	79	0	0	0	0	463
One or more suspensions	3	3	7	5	12	25	43	54	58	0	0	0	0	210
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	10	5	23	40	1	0	0	0	0	89
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	10	3	38	40	1	0	0	0	0	99
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	39	45	43	78	61	0	0	0	0	267
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	33	63	67	76	41	0	0	0	0	302
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	5	2	8	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	4	4	5	20	34	58	73	104	71	0	0	0	0	373

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	3	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/25/2022

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	97	106	119	127	143	159	211	238	230	0	0	0	0	1430
Attendance below 90 percent	24	20	28	19	29	33	33	52	39	0	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	10	15	26	22	19	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	8	15	34	26	36	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	9	8	66	53	29	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	35	37	58	56	36	0	0	0	0	250
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	41	52	62	51	43	0	0	0	0	271
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	5	8	9	5	2	0	1	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	1	3	0	24	37	49	84	70	55	0	0	0	0	323

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	97	106	119	127	143	159	211	238	230	0	0	0	0	1430
Attendance below 90 percent	24	20	28	19	29	33	33	52	39	0	0	0	0	277
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	1	10	15	26	22	19	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	8	15	34	26	36	0	0	0	0	125
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	9	8	66	53	29	0	0	0	0	173
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	35	37	58	56	36	0	0	0	0	250
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	41	52	62	51	43	0	0	0	0	271
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	5	8	9	5	2	0	1	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	1	3	0	24	37	49	84	70	55	0	0	0	0	323

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	52%	53%	55%				61%	60%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						60%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						46%	50%	54%
Math Achievement	54%	41%	42%				60%	58%	62%
Math Learning Gains	57%						50%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						36%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	44%	50%	54%				47%	58%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	71%	55%	59%				71%	74%	78%

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	66%	50%	16%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	51%	10%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	48%	0%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
06	2022					
	2019	62%	51%	11%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
07	2022					
	2019	58%	49%	9%	52%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
08	2022					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	56%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

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	66%	55%	11%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	54%	-8%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2019	50%	47%	3%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2022					
	2019	69%	47%	22%	55%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
07	2022					
	2019	62%	50%	12%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
08	2022					
	2019	27%	34%	-7%	46%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	45%	46%	-1%	53%	-8%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	45%	48%	-3%	48%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	69%	67%	2%	71%	-2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	51%	24%	61%	14%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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	19	42	41	22	42	38	22	41			
ELL	27	39	35	31	48	40	14	38			
ASN	61	74		61	80						
BLK	45	51	45	49	61	58	30	67	100		
HSP	48	51	40	49	54	51	39	56	78		
MUL	60	64		57	50		50	92			
WHT	59	55	51	61	55	48	54	85	82		
FRL	46	49	43	49	56	56	39	72	80		

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	19	33	32	24	43	44	24	48			
ELL	30	51	57	33	60	59	25	59			
ASN	70	75		58	50						
BLK	42	45	36	44	46	46	39	62	72		
HSP	51	57	41	53	59	56	49	64	80		
MUL	70	50		60	50		61				
WHT	57	57	48	59	58	51	56	81	77		
FRL	49	51	41	49	52	50	43	68	71		

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	41	33	27	40	27	20	43			
ELL	39	63	54	39	48	36	30	50			
ASN	79	78		74	61						

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
BLK	53	59	48	48	42	34	27	68	76		
HSP	62	61	48	63	52	40	45	71	85		
MUL	76	71		74	58		75				
WHT	63	59	45	65	53	38	58	71	78		
FRL	56	59	44	55	49	38	40	63	75		

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	57
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	69
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	52
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	62
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	61
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

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?

Our students that sit in the Low 25% in ELA are not making significant gains. This trend is seen in grades 4, 5, 7 and 8. 4th grade students that sit in the Low 25% in Math are not making significant gains.

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

The data components that have the greatest need for improvement: 2nd, 5th, 7th, 8th, ELA Low 25%, 4th Math, Low 25% and 5th and 8th grade science.

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 contributing factors could be that students did not have multiple opportunities to master the standard.
This year students will be monitored through PM1 and 2 and iReady. Students will be given instruction in small groups based on need. There is a math and reading coach on campus as well as a math and reading interventionist. The additional support staff will be working with teachers and students to develop individual plans that will be progress monitored for student success.

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

Improvement was seen in acceleration and math learning gains.

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

Contributing factors were deliberate teaching.

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

In order to accelerate learning teachers will participate in Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLPs). CLPs will occur weekly and will be attended by administration and/or coaches.

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.

To support this initiative, teachers will need training in CLPs. Teachers will also need training on new standards and instructional materials.

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

On-going site based PD will be delivered by admin and coaches to continuously support teachers with their learning.

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 English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	ELL students and SWD both scored below 41%. 36% of ELL students were proficient and 34% of SWD were proficient.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Both ELL and SWD will increase proficiency levels to at least 41%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ELL and SWD growth will be closely monitored through PM 1 and 2 as well as iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring. Students will be given assignments in iReady through their pathway as well as based on diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Piscopo (samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Students will be given assignments in iReady through their pathway as well as based on diagnostics. Students will be given differentiated instruction in small groups based on data from progress monitoring. Students in T3 will be given additional instruction and interventions through our interventionist.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These strategies allow us to use data to drive instruction while still ensuring students are exposed to and practicing grade level curriculum. IReady and small group instruction will give students multiple opportunities to receive additional instruction and practice on previously unmastered content as well as remediation on current standards. Continual progress monitoring will keep data current and assist teachers in adjusting lessons accordingly.

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.

Administer PM 1 and iReady

Person Responsible	Chad Davis (chad.davis@stlucieschools.org)

Analyze data from PM 1 and IReady and create small groups and intervention groups as needed

Person Responsible	Chad Davis (chad.davis@stlucieschools.org)

Progress Monitor data and student progress

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. 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.	Only 47% of 2021 2022 5th grade students scored proficient on the FSA. This falls below the 50% threshold and falls below the performance of other grade levels.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	More than 50% of current 6th grade students will score proficient on PM 2 and PM 3. More than 50 % of current 5th grade students will score proficient on PM 2 and PM 3
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	5th and 6th grade student growth will be closely monitored through PM 1 and 2 as well as iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring. Students will be given assignments in iReady through their pathway as well as based on diagnostics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Piscopo (samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will be given assignments in iReady through their pathway as well as based on diagnostics. Students will be given differentiated instruction in small groups based on data from progress monitoring. Students in T3 will be given additional instruction and interventions through our interventionist.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	These strategies allow us to use data to drive instruction while still ensuring students are exposed to and practicing grade level curriculum. IReady and small group instruction will give students multiple opportunities to receive additional instruction and practice on previously unmastered content as well as remediation on current standards. Continual progress monitoring will keep data current and assist teachers in adjusting lessons accordingly.

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.

Administer PM 1 and iReady

Person Responsible   Chad Davis (chad.davis@stlucieschools.org)

Analyze data from PM 1 and iReady and create learning plans for instruction

Person Responsible   Chad Davis (chad.davis@stlucieschools.org)

Progress Monitor and make instructional decisions.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. 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.**	5th grade science proficiency for 2021 2022 SY was 43% which was below the 5th grade ELA proficiency of 47% 8th grade science proficiency for 2021 2022 SY was 44% which was below the 8th grade ELS proficiency of 53%
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	5th and 8th grade science proficiency will meet or exceed the ELA proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Science data will be monitored through district pre and post tests as well as district unit assessments. Teacher instruction will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and CLPs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Samantha Piscopo (samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	5th and 8th grade teachers will participate in CLPs focused on planning lessons, analyzing data and reteaching through small group and Penda.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	CLPs will allow teachers to have a full and indepth understanding of standards and standards based instruction. The analysis of data will ensure that students are mastering content and/or receive small group remediation through reteaching and Penda.

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.

Create CLP schedule

Person Responsible   Samantha Piscopo (samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.org)

Plan lessons according to the district IFC
Analyze data from pretest and UAs

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our students that sit in the Low 25% in ELA are not making significant gains. This trend is seen in grades 4, 5, 7 and 8. 4th grade students that sit in the Low 25% in Math are not making significant gains.
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

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

53% of 5th grade students scored below a level 3 on the 2022 ELA FSA

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

More than 50% of current 6th grade students will score proficient on PM 2 and PM 3.
More than 50 % of current 5th grade students will score proficient on PM 2 and PM 3

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

5th and 6th grade student growth will be closely monitored through PM 1 and 2 as well as iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring. Students will be given assignments in iReady through their pathway as well as based on diagnostics.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Piscopo, Samantha, samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

5th and 6th grade student growth will be closely monitored through PM 1 and 2 as well as iReady diagnostics and progress monitoring. Students will be given assignments in iReady through their pathway as well as based on diagnostics. iReady is directly aligned to BEST ELA standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The use of IReady data and PM 1 and PM 2 data will be used to drive instruction while still ensuring students are exposed to and practicing grade level curriculum. IReady and small group instruction will give students multiple opportunities to receive additional instruction and practice on previously unmastered content as well as remediation on current standards. Continual progress monitoring will keep data current and assist teachers in adjusting lessons accordingly.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Administer PM 1 and iReady Diagnostic	Davis, Chad, chad.davis@stlucieschools.org
Analyze Data for PM 1 and IReady Diagnostic and create a learning plan	Davis, Chad, chad.davis@stlucieschools.org
Monitor learning and progress of students. Create small groups and intervention groups as needed	Davis, Chad, chad.davis@stlucieschools.org

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.

Manatee Academy has a strong positive culture and environment. Staff members operate under a team mentality and work together to ensure that students are put first. Staff have also created a positive climate that provides families with exceptional customer service. Manatee is dedicated to the well being of the whole child and extends those services to families as well.

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

All staff received professional development on the iSucceed initiative which promotes single school culture through combining all behavior related efforts into one. This allows staff to come together with a clear, consistent and positive approach to re-norming student expectations to a high level both academically and behaviorally.