

Manatee County Public Schools

# Florine J Abel Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Samantha Webb**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2022

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Florine J Abel Elementary School

7100 MADONNA PL, Sarasota, FL 34243

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">75%</p>

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

We will work together to build a positive school culture and provide the best instruction for our children.

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

Eagles Soaring to Success!

### 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
Webb, Samantha	Principal	Vision/Mission, SIP, PLCS, Data, capacity building
Moore, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Data, SAC
JONES, MATTHEW	Dean	DISCIPLINE, MTSS/IST
SHAFFER, AMY	Instructional Media	ELA, ATTENDANCE
Dorsey, Charlene	School Counselor	COUNSELING, GIFTED, 504S
BURGARD, GWENN	Reading Coach	READING COACH, INTERVENTIONS

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 8/23/2022, Samantha Webb

**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.*

4

**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.*

2

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

33

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

486

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

8

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

8

**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	74	83	79	85	58	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	448
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	16	10	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	9	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	23	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	17	18	29	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96

**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	6	5	12	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55

**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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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**

Tuesday 8/30/2022



**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	72	69	71	87	68	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	4	1	1	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	32	25	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	69	71	87	68	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419
Attendance below 90 percent	4	1	1	8	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	23	32	25	15	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	41%	55%	56%				41%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	60%						51%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						51%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	52%	50%	50%				58%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						72%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						63%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	65%	59%				41%	48%	53%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	39%	51%	-12%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	56%	-12%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	52%	-14%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

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	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	65%	-2%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	39%	48%	-9%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	18	37	40	26	52	58	33				
ELL	35	50		40	50		36				
BLK	30	59		35	73						
HSP	38	55	53	46	61	69	47				
MUL	36			64							
WHT	53	72		71	88		62				
FRL	38	55	48	48	68	68	44				
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	12	35	18	25	57	58	21				
ELL	27	33	33	54	81		28				
BLK	30	50		50	58		42				
HSP	38	36	31	58	76	58	42				
MUL	33			82							
WHT	44	43		61	79		54				
FRL	34	42	39	52	79	74	41				
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	17	59	63	39	86	78	25				
ELL	38	43	53	56	72	45	32				
BLK	34	45	36	46	58						
HSP	39	50	61	57	75	67	25				
MUL	53	50		79	60						
WHT	47	56	50	64	79	62	57				
FRL	36	48	59	54	70	68	36				

**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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	50
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
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	52
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?**

Proficiency is low in ELA across grade levels.

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

3rd Grade ELA proficiency (last year 26%)  
 ELA proficiency in grades K-5  
 Proficiency with in ELA for Student with Disabilities

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

Contributing factors were FSA data for grades 3-5  
 New actions to be taken for improvement: Professional development focused on ELA instruction for teachers, monthly progress monitoring of tier 1 assessments for grades K-5 (focus on 3rd ELA and if students with disabilities are making progress towards proficiency), focused instructional walk throughs for ELA

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

Learning Gains & Lowest quartile gains for ELA and Math

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

For ELA: daily formative assessments with writing in response  
Individual student learning gains and goal setting

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

Acceleration instruction provided for ELA and Math (and math club)

**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.**

Weekly Professional Learning Communities  
Opportunities for action based research cadres at school with a focus on acceleration practices

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

Weekly Professional Learning Communities  
Standards Based Collaborative Planning with Reading Coach or Admin. Member  
Frequent/Ongoing Progress Monitoring of Tier 1 data  
Frequent/Weekly instructional walk throughs

**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.**

Focus: 3rd Grade ELA Proficiency  
 In the 21.22 school year, our 3rd grade had only 26% of students pass with a level 3 or higher on the FSA. More than 50% scored a level 1.

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

By the end of May, 2023, 45% of students in grade 3 will score a level 3 or higher on the FAST PM Assessment #3.

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

Weekly PLCS with a focus on high effect size strategies  
 Weekly Instructional Walk Throughs  
 Monitoring of Tier 1 ELA monthly data (focus on comprehension and ORF for students that reading below grade level)  
 Coaching Cycles and Coach support for teachers  
 Weekly Standards Based Collaborative Planning with Admin.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

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

PLCS-Micro PD, Teaching with Clarity, Summarization  
 Walk Throughs-Feedback  
 Monitoring of Data-Self Assessment & Goal Setting  
 Coaching Cycles-Feedback

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

For all of our support systems for increasing 3rd grade ELA proficiency, we ensured that each support was rooted in research from John Hattie and aligned to our schools vision/mission.

**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.

Weekly PLCS (high effect size practices such as; Teaching w/ Clarity, Formative Assessments w/ Feedback, Questioning, Summarization)

**Person Responsible** Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

Monthly Tier 1 Progress Monitoring and Action Planning (Comprehension Unit Assessments for all students & ORF for students reading below grade level)

**Person Responsible** Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)

Instructional Walks w/ Feedback

**Person Responsible** Samantha Webb (webbs@manateeschools.net)



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

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

Based on the 21.22 FSA data, only 37% of our students with disabilities were proficient in ELA.

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

By May, 2023, 45% of our student population with disabilities will be proficient on the ELA FAST PM #3.

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

Monthly Tiered Data-analyzing our students with disabilities to see if they are making continued progress towards proficiency in ELA. Tiered data analysis would include IEP goals, Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 data (dependent on individual students). Data analysis will occur with our ESE team, consisting of Resource teachers, self contained teachers, administration, and reading coach. Data analysis will also occur for our students that are on alternative assessment, with IEP goals leading discussion and action planning. In addition to monthly data analysis and action planning, we will meet our ESE teachers bi-weekly for professional development with a focus on instructional practices, BEST Benchmark standards, high yield effect size practices such as scaffolding, teaching with clarity, feedback, direct instruction, summarization, and concept mapping.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Moore (moore7j@manateeschools.net)

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

Scaffolding instruction  
 Direct Instruction in ELA  
 Concept Mapping  
 Teaching with Clarity  
 Feedback

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this**

Our students with disabilities need additional supplemental instruction for core ELA foundational skills (such as phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and/or comprehension). Our students will be given additional instruction for 1 hour in ELA outside of the core 90 min. reading block, with a focus on foundational skills that target the students area of growth for reading. All curriculum/instructional resources will be vetted by What Works Clearinghouse and will receive a "strong" rating from ESSA.

**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.

Professional Learning Communities for our ESE teachers with a professional development focused on;  
direct instruction, scaffolding techniques, feedback, concept mapping  
Monthly Data Monitoring on tiered data (tier 1, 2/3, and IEP goals)  
Standards Based Collaborative Planning with ESE teachers, Gen. Ed, Teachers, and Reading Coach/  
Administration

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Moore (moore7j@manateeschools.net)

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior and Intervention Support**

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

In the 21.22 school year, we had over 120 referrals for the school year. Analyzing this data, we determined that over half of the students had less than 2 referrals. Our qualitative data (surveying staff at the end of the year) indicated that the majority of our staff did not have the tier 1 practices in place to minimize off task behaviors. In addition, in the 21.22 school year, data was collected on students and teachers that needed administrative support but did not receive referrals. This data indicated that a few teachers requested support from administration often, indicating support for specific teachers in classroom environment is needed to increase both teacher and student success.

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

By May, 2023, Office Discipline Referrals will decrease by 10%.

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

Weekly walk throughs in classrooms for teachers indicated as needing additional classroom environment support and new teachers  
 Monthly analysis of office discipline referrals  
 Monthly analysis of students receiving targeted behavioral interventions  
 Monthly analysis of teachers needing assistance from administration  
 Using data collected from monitoring tools, administration and our behavioral team, will collaborate with teachers, students, and families to develop plans for increased student success.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jennifer Moore (moore7j@manateeschools.net)

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

PBIS (Tier 1 and Tiered interventions)  
 Feedback  
 Coaching Cycles in Classroom Environment

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

PBIS is a vetted program to increase student on task behaviors. Resources/ Curriculum used will come from the University of South Florida's resources for PBIS.

**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.

Monthly data analysis of ODR

**Person Responsible**

Jennifer Moore (moore7j@manateeschools.net)

## 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

Direct & Explicit Instruction for BEST standards for all areas of reading and writing (Phonics, High Frequency Words, Fluency, Writing, etc.).

Opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered support interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring and data.

Daily Formative Assessments with text dependent questions and writing in response to text (kindergarten begins with oral responses)

Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria (Kindergarten/1st--foundational skills & 2nd--Comprehension)

Thinking Maps

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

Direct & Explicit Instruction for BEST standards for all areas of literacy in reading and writing.

Opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered support interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring and data.

Daily Formative Assessments with text dependent questions and daily summary writing

Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria for Comprehension

Thinking Maps

**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)**

By May, 2023, 55% of students in grades K-2, will score "on grade level" based on the ELA FAST PM #3.

By May, 2023, 100% of students in grades K-2, will make one year's worth of learning gains, comparing their ELA FAST #1 to their ELA FAST #3.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

By May, 2023, 55% of students in grades 3-5 will score proficient on the ELA FAST PM #3.

By May, 2023, 55% of students in grade 3 will score proficient on the ELA FAST 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.

Instructional practices monitored by grade level alignment of standards, tasks, and formative assessments in reading and writing. A yearlong calendar of Data Chats and PD will support implementation of BEST and new Benchmark Advance. Regularly scheduled walk throughs will promote feedback practices and build teacher capacity for standards-based instruction and effective use of instructional materials. Monthly Tier 1 ELA Data Analysis and Action Planning with a focus on:

K-1 Foundational Skills

2-5 ORF and Comprehension

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Webb, Samantha, webbs@manateeschools.net

**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?

Grade level teams will plan collaboratively using a consistent planning protocol that supports instructional alignment. Teachers will use district provided materials of Benchmark Advance for Core reading and writing instruction, aligned to BEST standards.

Tiered intervention support will be provided (selected from What Works Clearinghouse with a "strong" ESSA rating).

Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria--monitored by weekly instructional walkthroughs

Daily Formative Assessments with Feedback--monitored by weekly instructional walk throughs & standards based collaborative planning (where development of formative assessments occur)

Daily Writing in Response to Text (Summarization)--monitored by weekly instructional walk throughs & standards based collaborative planning (where development of writing responses/summaries occur)

Concept Mapping (Thinking Maps)--monitored by weekly instructional walk throughs & standards based collaborative planning (where development of concept maps occur)

Acceleration courses & Tiered Interventions--monitored by weekly instructional walk throughs

**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 purpose of planning, implementing, and monitoring responsive instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and to ultimately increase grade level literacy proficiency. Effectively delivered intervention instruction will support Tier 1 literacy learning toward grade level proficiency. Teaching with Clarity; Success Criteria--based on research from John Hattie--high effect size practice. When students are aware of what they will be learning for the day, including the daily formative assessment, this leads to self reported grading and goal setting. We will have targeted weekly PLCs to develop teachers with this practice (and additional focus practices)--including Micro PD and Lesson Study.

Daily Formative Assessments with Feedback.

Daily Writing in Response to Text (Summarization)

Concept Mapping (Thinking Maps)

Acceleration courses & Tiered Interventions--All curriculum is researched based. For supplemental/intensive instruction, curriculum is vetted by What Works Clearing House with an ESSA rating of "strong."

**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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve early literacy instruction & in Weekly Professional Learning Communities;

Collaborate with State Regional Literacy Directors to strengthen our Literacy Leadership Team, analyze instruction and data, develop action steps to increase proficiency, etc.

Implement grade-level collaborative planning

Provide professional learning for high effect size practice (areas of focus) using Micro PD and Lesson Study

Provide literacy coaching on focus areas and high effect size practice

Prior to Weekly PLCs; meet with Literacy Leadership Team to develop team instructional practices and goal setting for PLCs

Literacy Leadership Team and Grade Level teams will analyze data from PLCS (lesson study observation) to see if student comprehension increased)

Webb, Samantha,  
webbs@manateeschools.net

Monthly Tier 1 ELA Progress Monitoring;

Assessment will focus on foundational skills (K/1) and Comprehension and Fluency (2nd-5th)

Literacy Leadership Team will analyze data and develop action plan to increase proficiency

Grade level teams will analyze data and Literacy Coach will support classrooms where students are not making progress towards proficiency

Professional Learning will be developed during action planning process based on next steps to increase proficiency in ELA

Webb, Samantha,  
webbs@manateeschools.net

Implement the Decision-Trees from the Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan for reading intervention instruction.

We will have a one hour block of additional reading instruction for students that need tiered interventions or accelerated learning.

All instructional materials used are vetted through "What Works Clearinghouse."

Students receiving tier 3 intensive instruction will be instructed by a certified teacher that is reading endorsed.

Webb, Samantha,  
webbs@manateeschools.net



## 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.

Vision and Mission developed by staff and community stakeholders

PBIS: School wide Expectations, Pledge, and school song developed by entire school community (including students)

Implementation of Tier 1 procedures such as voice levels, tasks, ways to ask for help, etc. that will increase time on task

School wide instructional and culture goals developed by leadership team

Monthly Professional Learning for Staff on building and sustaining positive relationships with students and families

Monthly Professional Learning for Staff on trauma informed practices

Teaming up with community and business partnerships to provide necessities for students and families; clothing, weekend food bags, weekly food bags & opportunities to volunteer in the school

Monthly student celebrations of learning gains for reading and math

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

School Staff; development of vision/mission, development of professional learning needs

Community/Business Partnerships; input on vision/mission, school expectations, providing necessities to families

Students and Families; development of school wide expectations, pledge, school song

Families; support for academics and behaviors, volunteering for events, attending school wide events with children