Manatee Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Manatee Elementary School

1880 MANATEE RD, Naples, FL 34114

https://www.collierschools.com/mes

Demographics

Principal: Laurie Mearsheimer

Start Date for this Principal: 10/17/2016

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (63%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Collier 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

Manatee Elementary School

1880 MANATEE RD, Naples, FL 34114

https://www.collierschools.com/mes

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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Collier 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 are leaders who believe we can grow and succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower a community of responsible life-long leaders and learners who are motivated to achieve personal and academic growth and 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
Mearsheimer, Laurie	Principal	Instructional leader of the school. Ensures fidelity of instruction, adherence to standards, and oversees multi-tiered system of support for students. Leads the observation, evaluation and employee discipline process. Attends and provides feedback during grade level collaborative planning meetings. Facilitates and oversees professional development of the staff.
Dunn, Allyson	Assistant Principal	Assists principal in administration of the school including, ensuring fidelity of instruction, adherence to standards, monitoring the multi-tiered system of support and discipline of students. Observes and evaluates employees. Attends and provides feedback during grade level collaborative planning meetings. Facilitates and supports professional development of the staff. Serves as the testing coordinator for the school.
Cowan, Lori	Other	Responsible for facilitating IEP, EP and 504 meetings and the compliance of procedures and processes related to special education services and accommodations.
Spina, Michelle	Reading Coach	Supports reading and writing curriculum, instruction, progress monitoring/assessment in grades PreK-5.
Thomas, Kristina	Math Coach	Supports math curriculum, instruction, progress monitoring/assessment in grades PreK-5.
Mastromonaco, Lisa	School Counselor	Works with groups and individual students to support social emotional needs. Primary facilitator and trainer of positive behavior support systems for the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 10/17/2016, Laurie Mearsheimer

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.*
14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

Total number of students enrolled at the school
587

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

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	79	87	106	91	86	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	555
Attendance below 90 percent	17	27	28	22	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	5	12	4	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Course failure in ELA	3	21	34	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
Course failure in Math	3	21	30	20	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	23	36	27	24	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130

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	2	11	19	15	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69

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	3	6	7	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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

Thursday 9/8/2022

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	87	105	86	90	92	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	9	16	15	17	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	25	17	13	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	19	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	10	8	5	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	9	6	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	87	105	86	90	92	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	9	16	15	17	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	1	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	25	17	13	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in Math	0	19	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	23	36	27	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

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	10	8	5	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

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	9	6	9	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	51%	64%	56%				54%	60%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						50%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	70%						42%	51%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	56%	50%				65%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	72%						69%	64%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	73%						53%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	43%	72%	59%				54%	59%	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	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	58%	-13%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

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	57%	68%	-11%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	58%	65%	-7%	64%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	74%	67%	7%	60%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	52%	56%	-4%	53%	-1%

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	41	57	61	49	60	62	33				
ELL	49	73	83	64	79	88	36				
BLK	53	67	69	66	80	82	52				
HSP	47	66	77	64	72	83	35				
WHT	70	67		52	40						
FRL	50	67	71	62	72	76	41				

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	36	52	62	45	63	53	28				
ELL	47	47	53	55	67	50	41				
BLK	51	64		49	52		35				
HSP	51	51	53	63	72	46	52				
WHT	45			45							
FRL	50	55	57	57	64	47	42				

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	30	40	41	37	52	46	21				
ELL	47	47	46	58	66	56	50				
BLK	47	49	50	61	64	59	38				
HSP	54	50	38	65	70	51	58				
WHT	71	63		79	75						
FRL	51	48	44	64	68	53	51				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
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	64
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	57
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	64
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?

MATH
-Overall proficiency - increase from last year (FY22=64%, FY21=57%)
-Overall proficiency by grade level - decrease 3rd (52% to 51%), significant increase 4th (56% to 74%), no change 5th (59% to 59%)
-SWD proficiency - decrease 3rd (27% to 22%), increase 4th (33% to 54%), decrease 5th (41% to 22%)
-ELL proficiency - decrease 3rd (48% to 42%), increase 4th (51% to 72%), increase 5th (36% to 57%)
-Overall gains - increase *highest for MES (FY22=72%, FY21=65%, FY19=69%, FY18=63%, FY17=69%)
-L25 gains -significant increase *highest for MES (FY22=73%, FY21=47%, FY19=53%, FY18=51%, FY17=61%)
-Cambridge proficiency - increase 3rd (90% to 94%), increase 4th (92% to 100%), increase 5th (71% to 95%)

ELA
-Overall proficiency - no change (FY22=51%, FY21=51%)
-Overall proficiency by grade level - decrease 3rd (44% to 41%), decrease 4th (54% to 53%), increase

5th (45% to 47%)
-SWD proficiency - decrease 3rd (23% to 17%), increase 4th (25% to 36%), increase 5th (18% to 20%)
-ELL proficiency - decrease 3rd (36% to 33%), slight decrease 4th (46% to 45%), increase 5th (16% to 34%)
-Overall gains - increase *highest for MES (FY22=66%, FY21=54%, FY19=50%, FY18=60%, FY17=55%)
-L25 gains indicate improving trend *highest for MES (FY22=70%, FY21=57%, FY19=42%, FY18=50%, FY17=49%)
-Cambridge proficiency - slight decrease 3rd (95% to 94%), significant increase 4th (77% to 95%), no change 5th (74% to 74%)

SCIENCE
Overall proficiency - trending decline (FY22=40%, FY21=44%, FY19=54%)
SWD proficiency - decline (FY22=10%, FY21=23%)
ELL proficiency - increase (FY22=30%, FY21=20%)
Cambridge proficiency - increase (FY22=84%, FY21=69%)

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

Lowest area: Science proficiency (FY22=40%, FY21=44%)
ELA overall proficiency remains stagnant at MES (FY22=51%, FY21=51%)
3rd grade of biggest concern in both ELA and Math (overall, SWD and ELL subgroups) *see data above

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: less push in/resource support during science time; science planning and monitoring of instruction not focused on as heavily as ELA/Math; pandemic-related gaps in instruction on tested content for science as well as critical foundation ELA and Math skills

Actions to address: Increased monitoring and support for both planning and instruction in all content areas to ensure focus on critical content and identification/remediation of learning gaps; resource support during science instruction

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

Overall and L25 gains in both ELA and Math showed significant improvement:
ELA overall gains - highest ever for MES (FY22=66%, FY21=54%, FY19=50%, FY18=60%, FY17=55%)
ELA L25 gains - highest ever for MES (FY22=70%, FY21=57%, FY19=42%, FY18=50%, FY17=49%)
Math overall gains -highest ever for MES (FY22=72%, FY21=65%, FY19=69%, FY18=63%, FY17=69%)
Math L25 gains -highest ever for MES (FY22=73%, FY21=47%, FY19=53%, FY18=51%, FY17=61%)

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

Contributing factors were:
-Consistent push in support (Resource/ESE/ELL teachers; tutors)
-Resource teacher participation in collaborative planning and PLCs

New actions that were taken included:
-Focused intervention during MTSS block and after-school program
-Leader in Me initiatives to develop self-efficacy and student ownership of learning

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

-continuation of extended day and after school learning opportunities
-continued focus on Leader in Me initiatives (to include use of 4DX model and student accountability)
-adjustment of master instructional schedule to maximize resource support (ESE, ELL)

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.

-ongoing Leader in Me training (and onboarding of new staff)
-targeted professional learning on identified evidence-based strategies for each content area

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

Our literacy and math coaches work with teachers to ensure sustainable improvements in instruction.

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 Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Math Achievement - 64% of students in grades 3-5 were proficient in math as measured by the FY22 Math FSA (an increase of 7% for our school). With the instructional gaps created by the shift to B.E.S.T. standards, we will need to be intentional in our planning to ensure that we continue to increase proficiency. Instructional priority - utilize district curriculum maps and identified evidence-based strategies as B.E.S.T. standards are implemented to ensure that instructional gaps created by the shift to these new standards are addressed

Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	When teachers use evidence-based instructional strategies and adhere to district curriculum maps to ensure the B.E.S.T. standards and critical content for each grade level is taught, the percentage of students meeting proficiency in Math in grades 3,4,5 will increase by a minimum of 3% as measured by the FY23 FAST assessment (FY22=64% to FY23>=67%).
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitored by both the math coach and administration during weekly collaborative planning sessions, review of written lesson plans, in data PLC meetings and through classroom observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristina Thomas (thomaskr@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Evidence-based strategies supported by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics that we will implement to support increased proficiency in math include: -elicit and use evidence of student thinking to assess progress and adjust instruction to extend thinking -support productive struggle in learning math to allow students to grapple with mathematical ideas and relationships
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These evidence-based strategies were selected based on observations and trends in instruction. We frequently see teachers doing too much of the work and not allowing students to grapple with and internalize the mathematical concepts that they are teaching. Ongoing use of evidence of student thinking will allow for "on the spot" instructional adjustments and more frequent progress monitoring.

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 will be provided to teachers by our Math Coach on the B.E.S.T. standards, use of district curriculum maps and newly adopted instructional materials (McGraw Hill/Reveal), and effective instructional strategies for teaching mathematics.

Professional learning on the specific evidence-based instructional strategies of supporting productive struggle in math and eliciting/using evidence of student thinking will take place through scheduled direct instruction PD sessions as well as embedded PD during collaborative planning and coaching support.

Person Responsible   Kristina Thomas (thomaskr@collierschools.com)

Administration and Math Coach will monitor for adherence to district curriculum maps and B.E.S.T. standards as well as inclusion of selected evidence-based strategies (supporting productive struggle and eliciting/using evidence of student thinking) in both lesson plans and classroom instruction. Feedback (evaluative and non-evaluative) will be provided as appropriate.

Person Responsible   Allyson Dunn (dunnal@collierschools.com)

MES after school program will provide additional math instruction and targeted support for students in the lowest quartile in grades 2-5.

Person Responsible   Susan Pratt (prattsu@collierschools.com)

Resource teachers will be allocated/scheduled to include math instructional support in grades 3-5.

Person Responsible   Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Science achievement - this area continues to be our lowest achievement area with only 43% of students in grade 5 proficient as measured by the Florida State Science Assessment. We have seen a downward trend in science scores over the past three years, decreasing from 54% to 44% to 43% proficient. Instructional priority - ensure that science instruction takes place daily, is standards-aligned, and utilizes the 5E model and district resources
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	When teachers deliver daily standards-aligned science instruction that utilizes the 5E model and district resources, the percentage of students meeting proficiency in Science in grade 5 will increase by a minimum of 8% as measured by the FY23 SSA assessment (FY22=43% to FY23>=51%). This proficiency goal mirrors our FY22 ELA proficiency.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitored during weekly collaborative planning sessions, in review of written lesson plans, and through classroom observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Evidence-based strategies supported by the National Science Association and Marzano Instructional Model that will be implemented to support an increase in science proficiency include: -use of the 5E instructional model for lesson planning and delivery -Questioning to stimulate thinking at a high level of rigor -Exit tickets for frequent formative assessment
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	These evidence-based strategies were selected to ensure an engaging instructional sequence at the appropriate level of rigor. Questions will be included in lesson plans to reinforce concepts and stimulate student thinking while exit tickets will provide ongoing checks for understanding to allow for immediate instructional adjustments.

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 will be provided to teachers by administration and district staff on the 5E instructional model for science as well as effective use of questioning and exit tickets.

Professional learning on these evidence-based strategies will include direct instruction through scheduled PD sessions as well as embedded support during collaborative planning.

Person Responsible	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

Administration will monitor for inclusion of selected evidence-based strategies (5E instructional model, effective questioning, and use of exit tickets) in both lesson plans and classroom instruction. Feedback will

be provided as appropriate regarding use of these strategies as well as inclusion of differentiated instruction and ELL strategies to ensure comprehensible instruction for all students.

Person Responsible   Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

Resource teacher support will be allocated/scheduled to include science time for grade 5. Resource teacher will also attend and participate in collaborative planning for science.

Person Responsible   Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to student leadership and culture	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	As a Leader in Me school, we are working to increase student leadership opportunities and engagement in the learning environment.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	When MES Leader in Me leadership and engagement initiatives are implemented, the percentage of students in grades K-5 meeting proficiency in reading will increase by a minimum of 5% as measured by the end of year iReady end of year diagnostic assessment (FY22=55% to FY23>=60%).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Culture and leadership WIGs (in addition to academic WIGs) will be tracked throughout the year at the school-wide, grade level, classroom and individual student level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Students will use the 4DX model (4 Disciplines of Execution) to create and monitor culture and leadership WIGs (Wildly Important Goals).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Implementation of Leader in Me initiatives increases students' sense of belonging, self-efficacy, and accountability. Use of the 4DX model will provide structured principles and practices for creating, monitoring and achieving leadership and culture WIGs.

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.

All students will have a leadership role in our school this year. A "job fair" will formalize school-wide roles and grade-levels/classroom teachers will ensure that every student has a self-selected leadership role each quarter.

Professional learning will be provided for teachers on the importance of student leadership roles in developing students' sense of belonging. The concept of leadership "crews" for classroom leadership roles will be shared as an optional format of organizing student jobs. Teachers will have opportunities to observe colleagues who are using leadership roles effectively in their classrooms.

Person Responsible	Allyson Dunn (dunnal@collierschools.com)

Students in grades 2-5 will participate in monthly student leadership clubs. Clubs will provide additional student leadership opportunities and will include a "give back" community service or product to support a cohesive school/community culture.

Professional learning will be provided for teachers by our Leader in Me coach to ensure that teachers fully understand and are able to help students apply the 4DX model in developing their individual and student leadership club WIGs.

Person Responsible	Laurie Mearsheimer (mearshla@collierschools.com)

<div style="background:#2b2b6b;color:#fff;">

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.

</div>

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

ELA achievement in grades 1 and 2 are areas of focus for our primary grades. In both grade 1 and grade 2, 50% of students were proficient (on/above grade level) in ELA as measured by the iReady Diagnostic 3 administered in May 2022.

With identified gaps in foundational literacy skills, our instructional priority is to be intentional in our planning and use of evidence-based instructional strategies in both core instruction and tiered intervention to ensure that we close these learning gaps and continue to increase proficiency.

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

ELA Achievement in grade 3 and grade 5 are areas of focus for our intermediate grades. In grade 3, 41% of students were proficient in ELA and in grade 5, 47% of students were proficient in ELA, both as measured by 2021-2022 ELA FSA.

With identified gaps in literacy skills, our instructional priority is to be intentional in our planning and use of evidence-based instructional strategies in both core instruction and tiered intervention to ensure that we close these learning gaps and continue to increase proficiency.

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)

With intentional planning to close gaps and effective use of evidence-based instructional strategies in both core instruction and tiered intervention, the percentage of students meeting proficiency in ELA in grades 1 and 2 will increase by a minimum of 5% as measured by the FY23 STAR assessment (FY22=50% to FY23>=55%).

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

With intentional planning to close gaps and effective use of evidence-based instructional strategies in both core instruction and tiered intervention, the percentage of students meeting proficiency in ELA in grade 3 will increase by a minimum of 10% (FY22=41% to FY23>=51%) and the percentage of students meeting proficiency in grade 5 will increase by a minimum of 4% (FY22=47% to FY23>=51%), both as measured by the FY23 FAST assessment.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored by both the literacy coach and administration during weekly collaborative planning sessions, review of written lesson plans, in data PLC meetings and through classroom observations.
Ongoing feedback will be provided to ensure timely instructional adjustments in both core instruction and tiered intervention take place.

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

Mearsheimer, Laurie, mearshla@collierschools.com

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. §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?

Effective instruction begins with effective planning to ensure alignment of standards and evidence-based instructional strategies. Grade level teams will meet once a week for collaborative planning and will use district-adopted evidence-based materials (HMH Into Reading) and B.E.S.T. standards guides for instructional planning. We have identified the following evidence-based strategies as "strategies of focus" to support implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards in our school this year:
-Think-alouds to model how skilled readers construct meaning from text
-Concept maps and sorts to assess and develop vocabulary related to a new topic or book
-Instructional conversations and literature logs to allow students to respond to prompts/questions in both oral and written formats

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?

As 44% of our students are currently identified as English Language Learners (ELL), "strategies of focus" were specifically selected to support language/vocabulary develop and comprehension in both oral and written contexts.

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
Extended day time will focus on literacy instruction to increase students' vocabulary and comprehension. This time will include additional read-alouds and vocabulary activities utilizing the evidence-based strategies of think-alouds and concept maps and sorts. High quality read-alouds and books to support vocabulary development will be provided to each classroom. Our literacy coach will provide direct professional learning on these "strategies of focus" as well as PD during collaborative planning and coaching/classroom support time.	Spina, Michelle, spinam@collierschools.com
Professional learning will be provided to teachers by our Literacy Coach on the B.E.S.T. standards and adopted HMH materials as well as how to utilize our selected evidence-based "strategy of focus" of instructional conversations and literacy logs to support specific B.E.S.T. literacy standards during core instruction. Professional learning will include direct instruction through scheduled PD sessions as well as embedded support during collaborative planning and in-class coaching support.	Spina, Michelle, spinam@collierschools.com
ELL classroom support (resource teachers/tutors) will be scheduled, monitored and adjusted as needed. Professional learning for teachers regarding how to effectively utilize tutor support in the classroom will be provided. Tutors will also be trained on specific strategies for supporting ELL students.	Gonzalez, Emma, gonzalem@collierschools.com
MES after school program will provide additional ELA instruction and targeted support for students in the lowest quartile in grades 2-5.	Pratt, Susan, prattsu@collierschools.com
Professional learning will be provided to teachers by our literacy coach on effective tiered intervention (MTSS). Teachers will be trained to identify individual student's area of greatest need, write effective and meaningful SSPs, implement targeted intervention and monitor progress to ensure needed adjustments are made in a timely manner. MTSS time will be observed/monitored by both the literacy coach and administration to ensure implementation with fidelity. Student data and intervention/tier changes will be tracked on a school-wide data spreadsheet.	Spina, Michelle, spinam@collierschools.com

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.

As a Leader in Me school, our work is focused on the three pillars of academics, culture, and leadership. Every classroom begins their day with D.E.A.L. time (Drop Everything and Lead) to foster positive culture and understanding/demonstration of the 8 Habits. Twice a week, students participate in Connect for Success lessons and activities. At Manatee, we also have a weekly leadership focus and "manatee manner" of the week. Staff and student celebrations of both progress and success are an integral part of our daily work. We are also a PBIS school and embrace the principles of positive behavior support. We will continue to host parent events and student led conferences to ensure family connections and involvement. Community support is fostered by developing positive, collaborative relationships with neighboring businesses and organizations.

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

Teachers and staff promote a positive culture and environment through instruction, modeling, and active participation in our school action teams. Students promote a positive culture and environment through their actions and interactions as well as their participation in classroom, grade level, school-wide and community projects and initiatives. Our parents promote a positive culture and environment by participating in school-wide events including curriculum night, student-led conferences, student celebrations, music and art programs, and PTO events. Our community helps to promote a positive culture and environment by supporting our school with material needs (ex. uniforms, school supplies, etc.) as well as special holiday and other celebrations. Our community members also support with positive public recognition for our staff, students and school as whole.