

Manatee County Public Schools

Annie Lucy Williams Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

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

Annie Lucy Williams Elementary School

3404 FORT HAMER RD, Parrish, FL 34219

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

Demographics

Principal: Andrea Keezer

Start Date for this Principal: 8/25/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	33%
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 Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: B (57%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Annie Lucy Williams Elementary School

3404 FORT HAMER RD, Parrish, FL 34219

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	33%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

School Grades History

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

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.

Our mission is to inspire students, families and staff to have a passion for life long learning through building a strong community where students feel loved, respected and encouraged to develop to their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Williams Elementary is to create an environment to develop independent life long learners who will excel as productive global citizens.

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
Keezer, Andrea	Principal	Lead and support a group of educators to have the greatest possible impact on student learning in all areas.
Blanchard, Rachel	Assistant Principal	Lead and support a group of educators to have the greatest possible impact on student learning in all areas.
Carriker, Jennifer	Administrative Support	Lead and support a group of educators to have the greatest possible impact on student learning in all areas.
Lane, Rebakah	School Counselor	Lead and support a group of educators and students to have the greatest possible impact on student learning in all areas.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/25/2022, Andrea Keezer

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.*

6

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

746

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

6

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

11

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	112	106	123	121	125	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	724
Attendance below 90 percent	20	9	24	11	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	11	14	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	15	12	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	14	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	20	15	38	15	34	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	147

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

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	86	106	108	106	139	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	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	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	30	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	86	106	108	106	139	113	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	658
Attendance below 90 percent	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	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	9	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	30	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	74%	55%	56%				71%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						62%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%						42%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	80%	50%	50%				79%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	77%						80%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%						56%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	65%	59%				63%	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	66%	51%	15%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	58%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	52%	19%	56%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	80%	60%	20%	62%	18%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	80%	65%	15%	64%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
05	2022					
	2019	75%	60%	15%	60%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	63%	48%	15%	53%	10%

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	32	39	23	46	61	40	38				
BLK	53	67		68	69						
HSP	61	70		68	83		58				
MUL	88	83		88	83						
WHT	76	69	49	82	76	62	75				
FRL	62	67	47	71	74	60	63				
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	40	26	27	52	39	40	15				
ELL	60			70							
BLK	55			57							
HSP	68	54		76	77		77				
MUL	65			82							
WHT	77	66	29	84	76	55	74				
FRL	59	57	38	69	63	60	53				
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	16	39	42	38	65	58					
ELL	30	53	41	50	70	57	33				
BLK	52	27		52	73						
HSP	44	52	39	62	77	62	26				
MUL	67	64		74	77		50				
WHT	81	67	50	86	81	51	71				
FRL	51	50	43	62	70	49	45				

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
---------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
--	--

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	64
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	68
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	86
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	70
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	63
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?

The area of ELA needs to improve in all grades with a focus on increasing proficiency with our students with disabilities and our lowest performing quartile.

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

The past five years of FSA data show a weakness in the area with students with disabilities in ELA.

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

COVID factors to include: missing one quarter of school in prior grade levels, inability to collaborate with peers and diminished social skills.

Inclusion ESE model support from ESE Resource teachers, differentiation in the classroom setting, and collaborative learning structures will be used.

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

Our percentage tested improved by 4%. In ELA, learning gains increased by 7% and ELA lowest quartile increased by 10%. In math, learning gains increased by 4% and lowest quartile increased by 8%. In science, overall achievement increased by 6%.

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

We began to see more normalcy as the pandemic symptoms decreased. Less students and staff were absent due to quarantines. Quarantine times were reduced, allowing more access to learning.

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

We will be using an accelerated model of differentiation in ELA and Math for grades 3-5 and students will be grouped according to current data and needs assessments and moving to different classrooms where their needs will be met. K-2 will have a dedicated differentiation time for ELA and Math in their own classrooms scheduled in their day.

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.

We will have training opportunities to use new resources such as the DBQ project, Benchmark Advance Resources and the new BEST Standards. Peer support and modeling will be offered to all staff members. Instructional walkthroughs will be used to assess needs to determine the needs for coaching cycles across campus.

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

We will continue using current student data to make instructional decisions for every student. We will continue coaching cycles in all content areas by acknowledging teacher leaders and building capacity through teacher leaders based on strengths across campus. Formal and informal feedback will be given on a regular basis to all teachers. Additional small group instruction will occur as administration will work with identified students in both reading and math.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to 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.

It was obvious the need existed when analyzing student data from the 2021-2022 school year and even further back in the school's history. The subgroup was at 32% proficiency in reading in the 2021-2022 school year, far below the school proficiency rate of 74%. This discrepancy is unacceptable and it will be rectified through our plan.

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, at least 42% of Williams' students with disabilities will be demonstrating proficiency on the ELA Statewide Assessment.

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

Frequent walk throughs and check-ins with teachers during PLC meetings. Analyzing most current data as the year progresses. Data points will also be monitored through Statewide Assessments, District Assessments, and school based assessments such as DRA2 and First Steps in Guided Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

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

-We will use iReady Tools for Instruction-Students who are English Learners (EL), students with disabilities (SWD), and students with socioeconomic disadvantages (SED) using i-Ready Personalized Instruction all saw statistically significantly greater growth than students from the same subgroups who did not have access to the program during the 2017–2018 school year. Our programs are research-based and built from the ground up to be true to the details, rigor, and intent of college and career readiness standards. In order to connect the latest research with practical application in the classroom, i-Ready and Ready continue to evolve with guidance from expert authors and advisors who have a wide range of expertise in the field of education.

-Benchmark Advance Tier 2 and Tier 3 materials in grades 2-5:This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.

-Literacy Footprints will also be used in grades K-1: Does not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence, however three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through

3rd Grade IES Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In order to improve our ELA data, we will need to focus on identified students with disabilities, and provide them a reduced ratio in the classroom and use targeted, direct instructional practices to increase their reading ability.

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.

Walkthroughs-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard

PLC Meetings-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Classroom Teachers

Data Analysis-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Classroom Teachers, Jennifer Carriker

Person

Responsible

Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

It was obvious the need existed when analyzing student data from the 2021-2022 school year. The bottom quartile was at 46% proficiency in reading, far below the school proficiency rate of 74%.

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, at least 56% of Williams' bottom quartile students will be demonstrating proficiency on the ELA Statewide assessment.

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

Frequent walk throughs and check-ins with teachers during PLC meetings. Analyzing most current data as the year progresses. Data points will also be monitored through Statewide Assessments, District Assessments, and school based assessments such as DRA2 and First Steps in Guided Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rachel Blanchard (blanchardr@manateeschools.net)

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

-We will use iReady Tools for Instruction-Students who are English Learners (EL), students with disabilities (SWD), and students with socioeconomic disadvantages (SED) using i-Ready Personalized Instruction all saw statistically significantly greater growth than students from the same subgroups who did not have access to the program during the 2017–2018 school year. Our programs are research-based and built from the ground up to be true to the details, rigor, and intent of college and career readiness standards. In order to connect the latest research with practical application in the classroom, i-Ready and Ready continue to evolve with guidance from expert authors and advisors who have a wide range of expertise in the field of education.

-Benchmark Advance Tier 2 and Tier 3 materials in grades 2-5:This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.

-Literacy Footprints will also be used in grades K-1: Does not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence, however three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through

3rd Grade IES Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In order to improve our ELA data, we will need to focus on specific students with disabilities, and provide them a reduced ratio in the classroom and use targeted, direct instructional practices to increase their reading ability.

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.

Walkthroughs-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard

PLC Meetings-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Classroom Teachers

Data Analysis-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Classroom Teachers, Jennifer Carriker

Person

Responsible

Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

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

It is clear we need to move our overall proficiency in reading as a school.

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, at least 75% of Williams' students will be demonstrating proficiency on the ELA Statewide assessment.

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

Frequent walk throughs and check-ins with teachers during PLC meetings. Analyzing most current data as the year progresses. Data points will also be monitored through Statewide Assessments, District Assessments, and school based assessments such as DRA2 and First Steps in Guided Reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

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

-We will use iReady Tools for Instruction-Students who are English Learners (EL), students with disabilities (SWD), and students with socioeconomic disadvantages (SED) using i-Ready Personalized Instruction all saw statistically significantly greater growth than students from the same subgroups who did not have access to the program during the 2017–2018 school year. Our programs are research-based and built from the ground up to be true to the details, rigor, and intent of college and career readiness standards. In order to connect the latest research with practical application in the classroom, i-Ready and Ready continue to evolve with guidance from expert authors and advisors who have a wide range of expertise in the field of education.

-Benchmark Advance Tier 2 and Tier 3 materials in grades 2-5:This resource was a Moderate ESSA Evidence Level based on an Indian River Study. Source of the Study: Benchmark Education Company. (2020, January 30). ESSA Evidence for Benchmark Advance and Benchmark Adelante: Updated for the 2017–2018 to 2018–2019 School Years.

-Literacy Footprints will also be used in grades K-1: Does not meet strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence, however three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through

3rd Grade IES Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In order to improve our ELA data, we will need to focus on specific students with disabilities, and provide them a reduced ratio in the classroom and use targeted, direct instructional practices to increase their reading ability.

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.

Walkthroughs-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard

PLC Meetings-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Classroom Teachers

Data Analysis-Andrea Keezer, Rachael Blanchard, Classroom Teachers, Jennifer Carriker

Person

Responsible

Andrea Keezer (keezera@manateeschools.net)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to SPARK

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 2021-2022 school year, there were 104 student referrals written.

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, we will reduce student referrals written by 5% as measured by student incidents in FOCUS.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly ILT meetings will analyze this data and will identify students who appear more frequently with referrals. An action plan will be created to assist particular students in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Carriker (carrikej@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

We will implement CHAMPS across the school as a part of our focus on SPARK.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students fully understanding the expectations throughout the school day and in different locations will lead their success.

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.

Monitoring student discipline referrals monthly-Jennifer Carriker

Creating action plans for students in need-Jennifer Carriker

Person Responsible

Jennifer Carriker (carrikej@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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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.

In order to improve the school culture, we are bringing consensus to the school; allowing teams to decide what is needed across the campus in terms of materials, resources and ways to build community. We are adding community events to the school such as the Veteran's Day Performance, the Winter Wonderland Celebration and other onsite celebratory events to welcome the community to our school. We have an active PTO and an active SAC serving our school. We look forward to continuing our partnership with these organizations. In addition we have many community business partners who serve our school and our students. Many organizations choose to use our facility to host after school activities here on campus for our students.

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

Teachers-Lead instruction on their team and for students
Paraprofessionals-Support students and teachers
Office Team Members-Organize the school, Attendance, Purchasing and provide Customer Service
Visionary Leadership Team Members-Analyze schoolwide data and assist in developing plans to increase student achievement
Administration-Serve the community, Students and Staff Members
Custodial Services-Maintain the school facility
Food Services-Provide appropriate nourishment
PTO Members-Brings community together to serve our school
SAC Members-Partner with School as a community
Business Partners-Provide support to our school.