

Manatee County Public Schools

# William H. Bashaw Elementary



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>

# William H. Bashaw Elementary

3515 57TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

## Demographics

**Principal: James Dougherty**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

<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>	No
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
<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: C (49%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (55%)
<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>

# William H. Bashaw Elementary

3515 57TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>75%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>63%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>
<b>Grade</b>	C	C	C	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.**

The mission of Bashaw Elementary School is to cultivate distinct pathways for all students to succeed. Through a STEAM model of instruction, we inspire learning with inquiry investigation, collaboration, critical thinking, creativity and authentic experiences.

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

The vision of Bashaw Elementary School is to foster each child’s innate curiosity and joy of discovery, empowering them to be leaders and innovators of the future.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Dougherty, James	Principal	
Gil, Maria	Assistant Principal	
Alexander, Brianne	Other	Students Support Specialist
Stutes, Necole	Reading Coach	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Thursday 7/1/2021, James Dougherty

**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.*

5

**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.*

10

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

46

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

675

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

14

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

14

**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	102	106	108	112	119	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	667
Attendance below 90 percent	15	23	19	17	24	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
One or more suspensions	7	5	2	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	40	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	31	41	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	13	26	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
	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	0	0	0	0

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	

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

Monday 8/29/2022

**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	91	108	100	108	115	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	632
Attendance below 90 percent	39	36	38	40	45	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
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	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	21	36	33	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	6	12	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	91	108	100	108	115	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	632
Attendance below 90 percent	39	36	38	40	45	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	254
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	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	10	21	36	33	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	6	12	8	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	40%	55%	56%				47%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	52%						54%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						64%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	50%	50%	50%				47%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	57%						59%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						45%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	65%	59%				52%	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	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	56%	-16%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2022					
	2019	47%	52%	-5%	56%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

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	41%	60%	-19%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	65%	-28%	64%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	60%	-2%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	48%	5%	53%	0%

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

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	39	43	19	41	50	13				
ELL	25	41	27	26	43	47	19				
BLK	21	43	43	32	42	45	14				
HSP	30	42	33	41	51	46	31				
MUL	60	70		67	80						
WHT	56	64	64	63	67	80	63				
FRL	34	52	52	40	57	65	37				
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	16	17	17	26	36		9				
ELL	21	28	9	35	71		19				
BLK	35	57		50	67		21				
HSP	33	25	9	44	57	55	29				
MUL	56			56							
WHT	56	52		63	67		47				
FRL	35	35	19	46	60	53	31				
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	21	50	70	23	46	48	11				
ELL	20	54	71	44	57	47	27				
BLK	34	44	50	32	50	29	33				
HSP	31	58	68	43	62	50	37				
MUL	47	69		47	62						
WHT	65	52		60	63		75				
FRL	39	54	64	42	56	44	44				

**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	50

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
----------------------	--

<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
-----------------------------------	--

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

<b>English Language Learners</b>	
----------------------------------	--

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

<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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
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	69
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	65
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	50
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?**

- There was a low level of ELA achievement in 3rd grade for the 21-22 school year (36%).
- Students with Disabilities performed at a low level of achievement in ELA, Math, and Science.
- 4th grade showed a low level of growth in ELA and Math for all students, including students designated as L25's.
- Students with Disabilities showed a low level of achievement across all grade levels and content area.

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

- ELA proficiency demonstrated the highest need for improvement across all grade levels.
- 4th grade student learning growth in ELA and Math.

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

- We will need to continue utilize data to group students based off of need in targeted ELA standards in order to provide small group instruction during the core ELA block.
- Administration and instructional coach will continue to plan with grade level teams to provide rigorous instruction that meets the expectations of the BEST standards.

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

- Learning gains for L25 students in ELA 47% (19% in the 20-21 school grade projection).
- 5th grade learning gains in Math were 64%.
- 5th grade L25 learning gains were 62%.
- 3rd grade learning gains in Math were 85%.
- 3rd grade learning gains in Math were 100% for L25's.

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

- Targeting 5th grade L25's for additional small group instruction in ELA and Math. All L25's in 5th grade received an additional hour of targeted small group instruction per week on standards that were identified as in need per student groupings.
- Implementation of a daily 30-minute Math Club block in 3rd grade to reteach and remediate Math standards for retained students.

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

- Students will receive targeted small group instruction during the core ELA block based on achievement data.
- 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade students will be grouped to receive remediation or acceleration in ELA based on data during a 60 minute acceleration/remediation block.
- 3rd and 4th grade will offer accelerated core Math courses for students that are at a high achievement level based on data.

**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.**

- Multiple data chat meetings
- Professional learning opportunities on best practices
- Standards-based planning with instructional coach and/or administration present
- BEST standards professional development opportunities
- SIPPS training
- STAR Progress Monitoring training
- DBQ Training for reading acceleration
- Benchmark Advance training
- First in Math training
- Successmaker Training
- Acaletics training and support

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

- Continued support and training will be provided for school-based along with district instructional initiatives.
- Continued development of on-campus instructional leaders to serve as mentors for new or incoming

instructional staff of best instructional practices and programs.  
 -Continued instructional support through collaborative planning and data analysis sessions.

**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.

Based on the 21-22 FSA , ELA proficiency is at 40% for our 3rd-5th grade students. This is 11 percent lower than the district average.

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

Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency in ELA from 40% to 55% by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments
- District Quarter 2 ELA Benchmark Assessment
- Monthly Unit Assessments

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

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

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify needs, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

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

Bashaw's administrative staff will ensure that teachers are instructing students on the needed standards with the highest level of rigor. Bashaw administrative team will facilitate and support data-driven, standards based planning sessions.

**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.

Review 2022 FSA data with teachers to determine areas of need, instructional groups, and identify needed professional development based on areas of need.

**Person Responsible** James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Facilitation of teacher collaborative teams on multiple occasions with review of data for consistent readjustment in student groupings and instruction.

**Person Responsible** James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)



**#2. 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.**

According to data from the 21-22 FSA ELA Assessment, Bashaw's L25 students showed 46% learning gains. For the 22-23 school year there will not be a formal measurement for student growth, but by identifying, providing intervention, and monitoring these students we will work to close their gap in proficiency in hopes of increasing overall student proficiency in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency in ELA from 40% to 55% by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

**Monitoring:**

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST progress monitoring assessment
- Quarter 2 District Benchmark Assessment
- Monthly Unit Assessments
- DIBELS progress monitoring
- STAR progress monitoring

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Maria Gil (gilm@manateeschools.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Instructional implementation of strategies from research based programs outlines in our school district's Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree based on students need. Programs to be used will be Literacy Footprints, iReady Tools for Instruction, Benchmark Advance Tier 2 Intervention, Imagine Learning for ELLs, and SIPPS.

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

Bashaw staff members will use data analysis then adjust instruction to meet the students biggest deficit, then monitor with assessments and revisit data to look at additional areas of need when progress is achieved. Kindergarten through 2nd grade will utilize the STAR progress monitoring tool and 3rd through 5th grade will utilize the DIBELS progress monitoring tool.

**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.

Identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 level instruction and intervention through communication and collaboration with Bashaw teachers, specialists, and MTSS teams. We will also identify students that are in the lowest 25% quartile in ELA to determine interventions and tracking needed.

**Person Responsible**

Maria Gil (gilm@manateeschools.net)

Train teachers in use of Literacy Footprints, iReady Tools for Instruction, Benchmark Advance Tier 2 Intervention, Imagine Learning for ELLs, and SIPPS, depending on which interventions are needed.

**Person Responsible**

Maria Gil (gilm@manateeschools.net)

**#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to our ESSA Federal Index data our three subgroups that fell below the 41% threshold. Those three subgroups being 32% Students with Disabilities, 36% English Language Learners and 34% Black/African American.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Bashaw Elementary will achieve a proficiency level in ELA of 55% in the subgroups of Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Black/African American by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

**Monitoring:**

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments
- District Quarter 2 ELA Benchmark Assessment.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

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

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify the student needs in each of these subgroups, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

If additional intervention is needed student will receive tiered instruction from one of the research based resources from the district Assessment/ Curriculum Decision Tree, including Literacy Footprints (K-1st grade), Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 Lessons, SIPPS, iReady Tools for Instruction, and Imagine Learning for ELLs.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The use of student data along for grouping and instructional planning along with the use of intervention and tracking through the MTSS process will best support our students in these targeted subgroups to help them reach grade level proficiency in ELA.

**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.

Identify students in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 level instruction and intervention through communication and collaboration with Bashaw teachers, specialists, and MTSS teams. We will also identify students that are in the lowest 25% quartile in ELA to determine interventions and tracking needed.

**Person Responsible**

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Train teachers in use of Literacy Footprints, iReady Tools for Instruction, Benchmark Advance Tier 2 Intervention, Imagine Learning for ELLs, and SIPPS, depending on which interventions are needed.

**Person Responsible**

James Dougherty (doughertyj@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

Based on on the Spring iReady diagnostic, 60% of our Kindergarten-2nd grade students scored a level 3 or higher and are considered at or on grade level. 31% of our students are 1 grade level below, and 7.5% of our students are 2 or more grade levels below.

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

Basked on the 21-22 FSA , ELA proficiency is at 40% for our 3rd-5th grade students. This falls 10 percent lower than the 50% threshold.

### 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)

Bashaw Elementary will have 55% ELA proficiency for K-2nd grade students by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

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

Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency in ELA from 40% to 55% by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

#### 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.

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST progress monitoring assessment
- Quarter 2 District Benchmark Assessment
- Monthly Unit Assessments
- DIBELS progress monitoring
- STAR progress monitoring

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dougherty, James, [doughertyj@manateeschools.net](mailto:doughertyj@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?

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify needs, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

Instructional implementation of strategies from research based programs outlines in our school district's Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree based on students need. Programs to be used will be Literacy Footprints, iReady Tools for Instruction, Benchmark Advance Tier 2 Intervention, Imagine Learning for ELLs, and SIPPS.

#### 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?

Bashaw's administrative staff will ensure that teachers are instructing students on the needed standards with the highest level of rigor. Bashaw administrative team will facilitate and support data-driven, standards based planning sessions.

Bashaw staff members will use data analysis then adjust instruction to meet the students biggest deficit, then monitor with assessments and revisit data to look at additional areas of need when progress is achieved. Kindergarten through 2nd grade will utilize the STAR progress monitoring tool and 3rd through 5th grade will utilize the DIBELS progress monitoring tool.

**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
Review 2022 FSA data with teachers to determine areas of need, instructional groups, and identify needed professional development based on areas of need.	Dougherty, James, doughertyj@manateeschools.net
Instructional implementation of strategies from research based programs outlines in our school district's Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree based on students need. Teachers will be trained by our instructional specialist on resources including Literacy Footprints, iReady Tools for Instruction, Benchmark Advance Tier 2 Intervention, Imagine Learning for ELLs, and SIPPS.	Dougherty, James, doughertyj@manateeschools.net
Collaborative team planning and data chats will continue throughout the year to continue to monitor and adjust instruction and intervention throughout the school year.	Dougherty, James, doughertyj@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.**

- Monthly meetings of our school culture and climate committee focused around student behavioral data, trends, and scheduling of various lessons and campus-wide events.
- Various forms of communication to students and staff of various life skills components through morning news program, classroom visits, lessons, and school assemblies such as pep rallies.
- Use of SAC community stakeholders, communication of school-wide needs, initiatives, and updates on campus culture and environment.

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

- James Dougherty, Principal - Building capacity for school stakeholders, CHAMPS implementation, participation and guidance in the development and implementation of life skills education and Positive Behavior programs.
- Maria Gil, Assistant Principal - Building capacity for school stakeholders, CHAMPS implementation, participation and guidance in the development and implementation of school-wide life skills education and Positive Behavior programs.
- Brienne Carlisle, Student Support Specialist - Heading up CHAMPS implementation, Positive Behavior Support coordinator