

Manatee County Public Schools

Parrish Community High School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Parrish Community High School

11601 ERIE RD, Parrish, FL 34219

<https://www.manateeschools.net/parrish>

Demographics

Principal: Daniel Bradshaw

Start Date for this Principal: 1/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	34%
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: C (53%) 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Parrish Community High School

11601 ERIE RD, Parrish, FL 34219

<https://www.manateeschools.net/parrish>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>34%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>35%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21
Grade	C	

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.

Parrish Community provides a safe and supportive environment, focused on academic excellence, social awareness, and community involvement while creating innovative learners who are inspired to meet local and global challenges.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Parrish Community's vision is to provide a safe and supportive environment where all stakeholders are respected and inspired. Students are driven to possess social awareness, civic responsibility, and aspire for personal growth. Working together with parents, families, and business partners Parrish Community is committed to using innovative technology and authentic pathways to drive college and career readiness to empower students as they develop into citizens in an ever-expanding global community.

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
Little, Craig	Principal	Mr. Little oversees and coordinates instruction, academics, educational initiatives, administrative activities, and other happenings at the school site to ensure the school adheres to State and District policies and initiatives while upholding the mission and vision.
Ansbro, Diana	School Counselor	Mrs. Ansbro leads the school counselors in coordinating and implementing research-based practices for speaking with students and families.
Bieber, Jillian	Assistant Principal	Ms. Bieber assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of Professional Development.
Champagne, Paul	Assistant Principal	Mr. Champagne assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of SAC.
Cummins, Anthony	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Cummins is the Reading Department Lead and Growth Mindset Professional Development Coordinator for the school.
Dietz, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Dietz is the Math Department Lead and is actively involved in sponsoring the Student Government Association.
Gagnon, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Gagnon assists the principal in any and all instructional, administrative, and operational leadership activities and is the coordinator of the Instructional Leadership Team (ILT).
Grainger, Susan	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Mrs. Grainger is the CTE Department Lead.
Licata, Dana	Other	Mrs. Licata is the school's Testing Coordinator and helps analyze testing data. She is also the interim English Department Lead.
Paternostro, Nicole	Dean	Ms. Paternostro responsible for monitoring student behavior and addressing as needed.
Spivey, Erin	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Coach Spivey is a Physical Education teacher at the school site and involved with Athletic Boosters.
Kennedy, Ryan	Teacher, ESE	Ryan is ESE Department Chair.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Knaust, Alison	Teacher, K-12	Alison is Science Department Chair.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/1/2019, Daniel Bradshaw

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.*

1

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.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

93

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,033

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

16

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

30

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	525	580	506	421	2032
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	257	238	204	80	779
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	49	19	17	118
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	62	22	7	119
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	104	59	27	280
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	70	48	1	162
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	48	50	44	145

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	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	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated
Tuesday 8/23/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538	513	439	233	1723
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	51	51	25	174
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	44	9	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	9	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	47	50	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	25	25	0	93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	62	42	14	132

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	0	0	0	0	0	131	129	80	38	378

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	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538	513	439	233	1723
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	51	51	25	174
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	44	9	0	84
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	21	9	0	54
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	47	50	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	25	25	0	93
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	62	42	14	132

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	0	0	0	0	0	131	129	80	38	378

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	1	1	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	48%	51%					49%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	52%							47%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%							37%	42%
Math Achievement	55%	35%	38%					51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	48%							47%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	43%							45%	45%
Science Achievement	58%	45%	40%					67%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	43%	48%					69%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

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

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					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
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	18	29	29	29	44	40	25	44			
ELL	29	33	38	24	32	25	23	40			
ASN	84	80		92	67		80	82			
BLK	37	46	50	25	35	50	19	74			
HSP	51	46	36	41	50	43	46	58			
MUL	46	43	27	68	69		50				
WHT	59	54	44	61	47	43	64	69			
FRL	44	43	38	43	53	53	41	59			
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	25	29	21	28	13	8	26	47			
ELL	24	45	53	32	31		62				

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
ASN	71	68		88	7		88				
BLK	28	32	38	14	13		54	71			
HSP	55	51	34	41	25	30	62	58			
MUL	45	55	40	50			71				
WHT	60	49	36	50	26	31	72	68			
FRL	41	39	36	41	23	26	61	60			
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18

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	53
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	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	33
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	
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	81
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	42
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	47
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	51
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	55
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	47
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?

Lowest Quartile Learning Gains and Learning Gains are made in Math and ELA. Math increased 24% in Learning Gains and 14% in L25 Gains. ELA increased 3% in Learning Gains and 6% in L25 Gains. SWD and ELL is below the performance average of 46% in Algebra and 60.5% in Geometry. Major racial and ethnic groups - African American and Hispanic students falling 13-14% below the average.

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

The most recent FSA 2022 data demonstrate that the data component with the lowest performance is Science which saw a decrease of 12% from 70% to 58%. In addition, ELA Achievement saw a decrease of 1% from 58% to 57%. Social Studies remained consistent with achievement of 68% both 2021 and 2022.

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

PCHS is a new school in its fourth year of student attendance. It draws its population from the surrounding area which consists of new build housing and parents who commute for work. Many new students are from out of state and this provides a lack of reliable data to ensure support of their achievement. New actions for both areas include detailed data driven analysis of district assessments through PLC's and department meetings. Review scheduling practices, professional learning and monitoring of instruction. Sharing of best practices and areas of common concern.

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

Math Learning Gains, L25 Gains, and Achievement showed the most improvement from 24% to 48% (LG), 29% to 43% (L25) and 47% to 55% (Achievement). In addition, ELA showed improvement in Learning Gains 49% to 52%, and L25 Gains from 36% to 42%.

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

Small group instruction in ELA classes for students needing support. Learning strategies classes for students identified as ESE and level 1. Intensive reading instruction with level 1 students. PLC meetings with Algebra 1, 1B & 1A and Geometry teachers to disseminate and critically analyze data, teaching resources, standard and item analysis. Admin. working with teachers individually to share best practices and teaching strategies.

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

New strategies include data driven analysis of student achievement through PLC's and department meetings. Review scheduling practices, professional learning, and monitoring of instruction. Sharing of best practices and areas of common concern. Monitor the progress of students using the FAST testing blueprints and FLDOE BIG-M instructional guides.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development includes district trainings and in house trainings by district personal. New teacher cadres and mentor programs established. Target instruction focusing on standards, analyze district benchmark data. Provide ALEKS, Acaletics, and Lexia Power Up training for teachers.

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

To build capacity, sustainability and school culture, teachers will attend a new teacher cadre. Data - driven continued ILT and department meetings. Intensive Reading, Alg.1A and Math Data and Financial Literacy classes for students in the bottom quartile. Gifted Coordinator attends campus weekly to meet individually with students, create goals and monitor progress. Professional development will be provided to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Weekly MTSS/IST meetings. Non-proficient 2021-22 will be targeted for intervention.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. 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.

Although our ELA proficiency scores are above the district/state proficiency rate, we will focus on increasing scores of our non proficient students including our SWD and ELL students.

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

By the end of the 22-23 school year, there will be a 5% growth in reading proficiency based on the Florida Standards Assessments..

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

Using the new District adopted textbook (Study Sync) and curriculum maps, ELA teachers will instruct students on the new B.E.S.T standards for ELA. After progress monitoring 1 (PM1), 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers will review data from the FAST test. From there, each grade level team will identify areas of need for the next progress monitoring (PM2).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)

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

The Florida Assessment for Student Thinking (FAST) will allow teachers to monitor student achievement using Progress Monitoring 1 (in September) and Progress Monitoring 2 (in January). Evidence based strategies through McGraw Hill Florida StudySync and Lexia PowerUp Literacy for Intensive Reading classes include vocabulary building, collaborative discussion readings to build higher order critical thinking skills, short response questions, prompts, extended writing projects and extended oral projects for ELLs.

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

Due to the implementation of new Florida B.E.S.T standards, it is essential that we monitor the progress of all students including our SWD and ELL students for ELA proficiency throughout the year. Using the district adopted textbook, curriculum maps and FAST testing blueprints as our focus should result in student ELA proficiency.

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.

Based on 2021-2022 data appropriate professional development will be provided to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions including MTSS and CHAMPS training for all staff.

Person Responsible Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)

Appropriate students scoring non-proficient 2021-2022 or previous year's ELA assessment will be targeted for intervention.

Person Responsible Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)

Based on students' Quarter 1 Benchmark data ensure students showing signs of non-proficiency should be targeted with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions if not in place.

Person Responsible Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)

Based on students' Semester 1 Benchmark data ensure students showing signs of non-proficiency should be targeted with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions if not in place. Focused instruction includes remediating skill deficits, provide multiple opportunities to practice, provide immediate corrective feedback and provide opportunities for one to one tutoring/mentoring.

Person Responsible Dana Licata (licatad@manateeschools.net)

Curriculum and Administrative support data analysis/chats throughout the year to drive instructional focus.

Person Responsible Melissa Gagnon (gagnonm@manateeschools.net)

Curriculum and instructional specialists will coach and model for appropriate instructional strategies to differentiate learning to support learning proficiency.

Person Responsible Melissa Gagnon (gagnonm@manateeschools.net)

#2. 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.

Our math proficiency scores are below the state proficiency rate as measured by the EOC. Based on our data, our math proficiency gains were an average of 5% below the state. To improve in this area, we will target on our non-proficient population of students including our SWD and ELL students.

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year there will be a 2% math increase in math proficiency based on the Florida Standards Assessment.

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

Quarter and Semester Benchmark Testing
 Progress Grades
 FAST/EOC Testing
 ESE and ESOL accommodations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

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

Standards based curriculum materials with additional support for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction through McGraw Hill ALEKS and Acaletics Algebra 1.
 Intensive instructional support to implement the B.E.S.T. Mathematical Thinking and Reasoning Skills (MTRS) in all mathematics classrooms. Heavy emphasis on utilizing the B1G-M in each course for lesson planning and differentiation.

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

Due to the implementation of new Florida B.E.S.T. standards and MTRS, it is essential that we monitor the progress of all students for math proficiency throughout the year. Using the FDOE B1G-M instructional guides and FAST testing blueprints as our focus should result in student math proficiency.

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.

Based on 2021-2022 data appropriate professional development will be provided to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions including MTSS and CHAMPS training for all faculty.

Person Responsible Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

Appropriate students scoring non-proficient 2021-2022 or previous year's mathematics assessment will be targeted for intervention.

Person Responsible Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

Based on students' Quarter 1 Benchmark data ensure students showing signs of non-proficiency should be targeted with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions if not in place.

Person Responsible Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

Based on students' Semester 1 Benchmark data ensure students showing signs of non-proficiency should be targeted with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions if not in place.

Person Responsible Heather Dietz (dietzh@manateeschools.net)

Curriculum and Administrative support data analysis/chats throughout the year to drive instructional focus.

Person Responsible Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

Curriculum and instructional specialists will coach and model for appropriate instructional strategies to differentiate learning to support learning proficiency.

Person Responsible Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

#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.

Our science proficiency scores are below the state and district proficiency rate as measured by the EOC. Based on our data, our science proficiency gains were 3% below the district and state. To improve this area, we will focus on our non-proficient population of students including our SWD and ELL students.

Measurable

Outcome:

State the specific measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal for the 22-23 school year is 65% proficiency on the Biology EOC.

Monitoring:

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

Students will track their pre and post knowledge checks throughout the school year to reference back on what to study and review. This will also give insight to overall success on topics and standards and allow teachers to plan together and create interventions for students in need with reteaching. Pre and post knowledge checks for topics and standards. Class assessments and assignments, comparing data between teachers and classes based on level (regular or honors).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alison Knaust (knausta@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Standards based State/district curriculum materials in conjunction with additional support for Tier 2 & 3 instruction through HMH Dimensions, Gizmos, lab activity, Progress Learning. Strategies include exploration, analysis, application and explanation. Problem solving investigations enable students to state claims, gather evidence and explain reasoning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Following CPalms, district curriculum maps and scope and sequence will support standards based learning for student success on the EOC Biology exam.

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.

Based on 2021-22 data appropriate professional development will be provided to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions including MTSS and CHAMPS training for all faculty.

Person Responsible Alison Knaust (knausta@manateeschools.net)

Based on district Quarter 1 benchmark and Semester 1 student data, standards and item analysis will be reviewed, analyzed and remediated.

Person Responsible Alison Knaust (knausta@manateeschools.net)

Students showing signs of non-proficiency on Quarter 1 and Semester 1 will be supported with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible Alison Knaust (knausta@manateeschools.net)

District Curriculum and Admin support data analysis/chats throughout the year to drive instructional focus.

Person Responsible Melissa Gagnon (gagnonm@manateeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Although our social studies proficiency scores for the U.S. History EOC exam are above the state and district proficiency rate of 65%, our score remained consistent at 68%. To improve this area, we will focus on our non-proficient population of students including our SWD and ELL students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 73% of students taking the US History EOC will receive a score of 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

District Benchmark Data and classroom assessments analyzed for trends through department meetings and PLC's. Collaboration to create assessments to monitor student achievement towards the standards for the course.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Standards based State/district curriculum materials will be used in conjunction with additional support for Tier 2 and 3 instruction through McGraw Hill Textbook and Gateway to US History for test prep, Strategies include vocabulary building, cooperative learning projects, critical thinking through primary source documents and practice assessments to prepare students for the EOC exam. .

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Following CPalms, district curriculum maps, and scope and sequence maps will support standards based learning for student success on the U.S. History EOC exam.

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.

Based on 2021-22 data appropriate professional development will be provided to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions including MTSS and CHAMPS training for all staff.

Person Responsible

Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

Based on district Quarter 1 benchmark and Semester 1 student data, standards and item analysis will be reviewed, analyzed and remediated.

Person Responsible

Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

Students showing signs of non-proficiency on Quarter 1 and Semester 1 will be supported with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

Person Responsible Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

District Curriculum and Admin support data analysis/chats throughout the year to drive instructional focus.

Person Responsible Jillian Bieber (bieberj@manateeschools.net)

#5. -- 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

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

N/A

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)

N/A

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.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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 Parrish Community High School, a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved is created through Growth Mindset Professional Developments with teachers, opportunities on Instructional Leadership Teams and Intensive Support Teams, SAC Meetings, Booster Club Meetings, and an active Key Club at the school.

The Growth Mindset Professional Developments help to create a culture of learning and growth, with an emphasis on meeting students where they are to help them improve through Tier 1,2, and 3 support.

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

The SAC and Booster clubs meet regularly with all stakeholders - teachers, parents, community members, students, and administration - to help foster initiatives to better the school overall.

Faculty professional development, ILT and MTSS/IST meetings encourage teacher feedback, teacher input, and parent input to support student growth.

The Key Club initiates community service activities to involve the school in the community and the community in the school.