Sea Breeze Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/seabreeze

Demographics

Principal: Aliki Bovoletis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

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	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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (53%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 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.](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

Sea Breeze Elementary School

3601 71ST ST W, Bradenton, FL 34209

https://www.manateeschools.net/seabreeze

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	61%

School Grades History

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

Sea Breeze Elementary School strives to maintain high expectations and promote academic excellence for all students by creating a positive school climate which respects and values diversity and nurtures self-esteem.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sea Breeze Elementary School values all our students and diversity. Communication among all stakeholders is important to support high academic standards.

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
Bovoletis, Aliki	Principal	School Instructional Leader supporting with Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions LEA representative supporting staff and students involving Exceptional Student Education Supporting staff and students with family engagement activities to promote Title I standards and requirements Supporting staff and students by complying with and promoting safety protocols set by the district
Blackmore, Todd	Assistant Principal	Administrative School Assessment Coordinator School Acaletics Leader School Textbook Coordinator School Instructional Leader supporting with Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III interventions LEA representative involving Exceptional Student Education Supporting staff and students with family engagement activities to promote Title I standards and requirements Supporting staff and students by complying with and promoting safety protocols set by the district
Shapiro, Samantha	Other	Supporting staff and students with CHAMPS implementation Supporting staff and students with behavior interventions Supporting staff and students with SOAR implementation Supporting staff and students with family engagement activities

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Aliki Bovoletis

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.*

0

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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

460

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.

12

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	78	93	90	87	63	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475
Attendance below 90 percent	33	40	39	29	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188
One or more suspensions	11	27	14	10	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA	0	38	20	27	10	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
Course failure in Math	0	28	12	35	16	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	24	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	14	28	27	24	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	22	10	27	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Wednesday 9/7/2022

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	73	92	89	91	65	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	23	37	35	32	33	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	10	17	39	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	73	92	89	91	65	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	479
Attendance below 90 percent	23	37	35	32	33	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	12	10	17	39	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	44%	55%	56%				50%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%						52%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						56%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	55%	50%	50%				59%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						52%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						29%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	65%	59%				48%	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	43%	51%	-8%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	47%	56%	-9%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	46%	52%	-6%	56%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

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	60%	60%	0%	62%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	51%	65%	-14%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2022					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	60%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2022					
	2019	42%	48%	-6%	53%	-11%
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	20	45	45	34	58	69	20				
ELL	40	40		53	54						
BLK	28	38		37	67	60	27				
HSP	45	50	43	49	49	50	38				
MUL	39	73		53	64						
WHT	53	54		69	74		60				
FRL	39	47	55	54	65	64	36				

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	19	28	45	27	33	40					
ELL	37			37			40				
BLK	38	35		39	44		50				
HSP	34	37		36	53		35				
MUL	50			69							
WHT	55	45		62	55		50				
FRL	39	31	42	43	46	43	39				

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	28	44	50	40	49	29	35				
ELL	34	50	65	48	50	36	29				
BLK	40	51	54	48	33	16	38				
HSP	43	52	58	49	52	42	36				
MUL	53	55		65	55						
WHT	57	51	60	69	60	27	57				
FRL	46	48	51	56	50	31	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	418
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	46
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	43
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	46
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	57
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	
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	62
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?

We saw an average increase of 11% in ELA LG, ELA L25 LG, Math achievement, Math LG, and Math L25 LG when compared to last statewide assessments. ELA achievement has dropped 6% from 2019 statewide assessment. Subgroups across the board are fundamentally stronger in Math than ELA, based upon assessment data.

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

Learning gains outweigh achievement (proficiency) percentages in both 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?

The primary contributing factory to non-proficiency in grades 3-5 was the lack of remedial and differentiated instruction for Tier 1. New actions would be to focus on ELA Tier 1 instruction, including the structure of the ELA block, engagement strategies, standards based instruction, and Learning Walk using the Data Cycle for planning for improvement.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement.

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

The primary contributing factory was Acaletics including differentiated instruction and staff working with the bubble students. New actions will be integrating Math into the Fine Arts Curriculum, having students in all grade levels attend STEM, implementing First in Math and Success Maker on a weekly basis..

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

Differentiated small group instruction during the intervention block for ELA to help challenge higher level students and differentiated Math groups during Acaletics. In grades 3-5 there will be a ELA Acceleration class and in grades 3-4 there will be a Math Acceleration Course to help challenge higher level students.

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

Professional development opportunities for staff will include peer modeling, learning walks, collaborative planning, and engagement strategies including SIOP. The Acaletic Trainer will do two PD days with staff members in grades 2nd-5th.

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

Additional service to ensure sustainability include after school tutoring, collaborative planning, TCT, quarterly data meetings, and data from Learning Walk.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELA and Math proficiency is an area of focus based on FSA Data and i-Ready Data. ELA was a low area of proficiency at 44%. Math proficiency was 55%. To increase our ELA proficiently to 50% and Math proficiency to 60% we will focus on tier 1 instruction that is rigorous, aligned to the standards, including grade level appropriate vocabulary, checks for understanding throughout the lesson and engagement strategies.
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 Sea Breeze students in grades 3-5 will achieve 50 % proficiency as measured by the ELA state assessment and 60% in Math measured by the state assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This area of focus will be monitoring by looking at data from Learning Walks, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, SRA, District Assessments and State Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	During the ELA and Math block we will focus on tier 1 instruction that is rigorous, aligned to the standards, including grade level appropriate vocabulary, checks for understanding throughout the lesson and engagement strategies. In addition student will receive an extended hour of differentiated leveled small group reading instruction. Students below grade level will receive additional support based on their needs in Math and ELA. https://meadowscenter.org/ EIRC https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/topic-research/engagement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Our focus is to improve reading fluency and comprehension and math proficiency in an differentiated learning environment with multisensory interventions including, SRA Corrective Reading: For Math Envisions, First in Math and Success Maker will be used to increase fact fluency and proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Train Staff on the new B.E.S.T Standards, new curriculum and new resources through mini PD's, two planning days, TCT, Collaborative planning and staff meetings.
2. Administer being of the year assessments.

3. Analyze data

4. Communicate tier 1 expectations

5. Group student for remediation and Acceleration.

6. Conduct Learning Walks to collect data and plan next steps.

Person Responsible   Samantha Shapiro (shapiros@manateeschools.net)

#2. 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.**	One of the lowest area of proficiency was the SWD and Black subgroups based on FSA and i-Ready Data. Black-ELA Proficiency 28% SWD - ELA Proficiency 20%
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 Sea Breeze will increase proficiency in Black students to 40% Proficiency in ELA and SWD students to 30% Proficiency in ELA based on SRA, running records, District, and state assessments.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	This area of focus will be monitoring by looking at data from Learning Walks, Benchmark Advance Unit Assessments, SRA, District Assessments and State Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Todd Blackmore (blackmot@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	During the ELA and Math block SWD will be integrated into a general education class to get exposure to rigorous instruction aligned to the standards, including grade level appropriate vocabulary, checks for understanding throughout the lesson and engagement strategies. In addition student will receive and extended hour of differentiated leveled small group reading instruction. Students below grade level will receive additional support based on their needs in Math and ELA on a daily basis. Students that are below grade level will receive 8 to 20 weeks of after school tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the**	SWB and low income sub groups benefit from exposure to grade level standards based instruction. Small group instruction helps to provide instruction that is tailored to the students needs in smaller environment. The Education Trust https://edtrust.org/

**resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Identifying students that can be pushed into a general education setting.
2. Creating a schedule that allows students in grades 3-5 to be exposed to general education instruction.
3. Plan differentiated small group instruction to target learning deficiencies in SWD and Black students.
4. Review data every 6 weeks in ILT, TCT meeting to make learning adjustments as needed.

**Person
Responsible**   Aliki Bovoletis (bovoletisa@manateeschools.net)

Providing teachers training on new intervention materials to use during the intervention block and after school tutoring using ESSAR Funds.

**Person
Responsible**   Todd Blackmore (blackmot@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

Students in grades K-2 will receive direct and explicit instruction on the BEST standards of all areas of reading and writing aligned to the benchmarks of expected student outcomes for their grade level. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered support interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring and running records data. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development.

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

Students in grades 3-5 will receive instruction on the BEST standards for all areas of literacy in reading and writing aligned to benchmarks of expected student outcomes for their grade level. Opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered support interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning, citing evidence, and problem solving.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, at least 50% of students in grades K-2 will score proficiency in ELA as measured by state progress monitoring assessment aligned to B.E.S.T.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

By May 2023, at least 50% of students in grades 3-5 will score proficiency in ELA as measured by state progress monitoring assessment aligned to B.E.S.T.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Instructional practices will be monitored through the review of collaborative planning, lesson plans, and grade level alignment of standards, tasks, and formative assessments in reading and writing. A yearlong calendar of Data Chats and PD will support implementation of B.E.S.T. and new Benchmark Advance. MTSS is the systemic evaluation of instructional efficacy across all Tiers. Regularly scheduled walkthroughs will promote feedback practices and build teacher capacity for standards-based instruction and effective use of instructional materials.

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

Bovoletis, Aliki, bovoletisa@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. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Grade-level teams will plan collaboratively using a consistent planning protocol that supports instructional alignment. Teachers will use district-provided materials of Benchmark Advance for CORE reading and writing instruction aligned to B.E.S.T. Tiered intervention support will be provided using guided reading materials, and additional programs will be used to provide direct and explicit systematic instruction for more intense interventions. All learning will be progress-monitored through DIBELS for tier 2 and tier 3 interventions, and CORE instruction will be monitored through writing formative assessments and unit assessments aligned to the grade level benchmarks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The purpose of monitoring and implementing responsive instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and increase grade-level literacy proficiency. By consistently monitoring student progress toward grade level mastery, there is a more significant opportunity to improve student growth in reading and writing.

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
All action steps for the B.E.S.T implementation Area of Focus apply to the RAISE Area of Focus: Implement grade-level collaborative planning and provide professional development for Benchmark Advance, MTSS - A, FAST, running records, and the new writing rubrics. Provide ongoing coaching based upon student data, classroom observations, and teacher evaluation. School leadership will ensure the implementation of district curriculum/pacing guides and assessment calendars. Participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve early literacy instruction. Implement the Decision-Trees from the Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan for reading intervention instruction	Bovoletis, Aliki, bovoletisa@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.

The school addresses building a positive school culture and environment through the use of Champs/ Sparks , SOAR boards (monthly board that students that get positive shout outs write their names on and 10 squares
get drawn for a prize) and positive Dojo points. We identify the trait of the Month on the morning news, our school sign and connect eds. Teachers make positive phone calls to each student the first 2 weeks of school. The leadership team gives positive feedback to each staff member the first semester of school. There is a sign at the front entrance with a positive message to set the tone every morning. We celebrate staff with monthly birthday treats and popcorn. We get community business partners to donate bagels, juice and other treats for the staff monthly.

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

The Principal, Assistant Principal, SSS, teachers and GET help promote a positive school environment.

Principal-Staff positive reinforcement, reinforcing SPARK being used consistently and effectively, positive quotes.
Assistant Principal-SPARKS trainer, staff positive reinforcement, reinforcing SPARK being used consistently and effectively.
SSS- SOAR Board, SPARKS trainer, positive behavior reinforcement, staff positive reinforcement.
GET- Community donations for student and staff.
Teachers- Positive phone calls, implementing SPARKS, positive Dojo points, positive classroom environment.