

The School District of Lee County

Manatee 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Manatee Elementary School

5301 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://man.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Scott Lemaster

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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: D (35%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI

* 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 Lee 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Manatee Elementary School

5301 TICE ST, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://man.leeschools.net/>

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	89%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

Manatee Elementary will develop world class citizens ready for the future through mindfulness, engaged learning, academic excellence, and teamwork.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Elementary.....Leading the Way, Every Student, Every Day.

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
Sherman, Diane	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Empower faculty to work as a system focused on student learning ▪ Engage faculty in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school ▪ Maintain a school climate that supports student engagement in learning and generates high expectations for learning growth by all students ▪ Work collaboratively to implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs, and assessments. ▪ Engage in data analysis for instructional planning and student learning ▪ Recruit, retain, and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff
Forkey, Tammy	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide instructional leadership within the school setting through focusing on a shared vision and creating a climate and culture conducive to continuous improvement, student achievement, and social, emotional, and behavioral development. ▪ Co-develop school plans and organizational procedures for the health, safety, discipline, and conduct of students as established by District policies and procedures. ▪ Maintain and carry out adopted policies of the School Board and of the District administration. ▪ Communicate with staff to assure instructional programs meet student needs and District requirements. ▪ Facilitate a safe and purposeful learning environment by addressing student behavior by utilizing due process and restorative justice techniques. ▪ Co-supervise the school staff and be responsible for the recruitment, screening, hiring, training, assigning, and evaluation of the staff. ▪ Participate in and provide leadership in supporting parent/teacher groups, school/business partnerships, community agencies, etc.
Restino, Caitlin	Assistant Principal	<p>Provide instructional leadership within the school setting through focusing on a shared vision and creating a climate and culture conducive to continuous improvement, student achievement, and social, emotional, and behavioral development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Co-develop school plans and organizational procedures for the health, safety, discipline, and conduct of students as established by District policies and procedures. ▪ Maintain and carry out adopted policies of the School Board and of the District administration. ▪ Communicate with staff to assure instructional programs meet student needs and District requirements. ▪ Facilitate a safe and purposeful learning environment by addressing student behavior by utilizing due process and restorative justice techniques. ▪ Co-supervise the school staff and be responsible for the recruitment, screening, hiring, training, assigning, and evaluation of the staff. ▪ Participate in and provide leadership in supporting parent/teacher groups, school/business partnerships, community agencies, etc.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sheplak, Ashley	Other	<p>Instruct students approximately 50% of the time, preferably in a core subject area, and fulfill instructional coaching duties approximately 50% of the time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design and deliver professional development opportunities at the school level for faculty and staff. ▪ Provide one-on-one and group mentoring to apprentice and mentor teachers. ▪ Model, observe, and provide feedback to teachers through the utilization of an instructional coaching cycle. ▪ Lead and guide professional learning communities through data analysis that results in the selection, implementation, and evaluation of research-based instructional strategies. ▪ Work collaboratively with the building principal, assistant principal, faculty, and staff to address site-based professional learning needs. ▪ Provide a schedule of activities including lesson plans and a professional development calendar to be shared with teachers and administrators. ▪ Assist in identifying and developing future leaders in the building

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Scott Lemaster

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.*

2

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.*

19

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

734

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

17

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	91	127	138	150	135	157	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	798
Attendance below 90 percent	43	65	64	69	53	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358
One or more suspensions	3	3	8	6	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	68	60	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	57	55	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	9	29	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	12	9	10	25	56	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177

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	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/25/2022

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	100	124	142	159	129	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	810
Attendance below 90 percent	7	43	43	46	36	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	3	6	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	1	21	18	39	45	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
Course failure in Math	1	13	12	23	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	36	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	40	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	1	21	19	35	52	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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	2	2	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	100	124	142	159	129	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	810
Attendance below 90 percent	7	43	43	46	36	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	215
One or more suspensions	0	3	6	5	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	1	21	18	39	45	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
Course failure in Math	1	13	12	23	32	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	36	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	9	40	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
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	1	21	19	35	52	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188

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	2	2	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	27%	52%	56%				40%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	36%						53%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39%						58%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	40%	45%	50%				64%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	40%						80%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						69%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	59%	59%				45%	52%	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	31%	58%	-27%	58%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	56%	61%	-5%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	68%	62%	6%	64%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	50%	-9%	53%	-12%
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	24	41	40	29	27	15	18				
ELL	18	32	32	38	44	27	37				
BLK	20	34	50	29	36	25	27				
HSP	26	36	35	41	39	26	41				
MUL	33			42							
WHT	42	41		48	56						
FRL	28	35	38	41	40	28	37				

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	17	58		24	45						
ELL	34	66	71	55	65	68	29				
BLK	33	40		33	46		17				
HSP	38	64	74	56	63	70	31				
WHT	53			63							
FRL	37	58	75	51	54	47	27				
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	18	48	47	33	80	79	55				
ELL	32	45	58	62	76	59	33				
BLK	35	58	63	49	73	76	38				
HSP	40	50	55	67	81	66	41				
WHT	48	72		60	89		75				
FRL	36	50	58	61	79	68	41				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

English Language Learners	
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	32
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	36
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	47
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

- low ELA proficiency across all grade levels
- low Math proficiency across all grade levels
- 75% of 3rd and 4th grade students scored Level 1 or Level 2 in ELA
- more than 60% of 3rd and 4th grade students scored Level 1 or Level 2 in Math

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

- 26% of 4th grade students are 2 or more grade levels below in ELA
- 37% of 3rd grade students are 2 or more grade levels below in ELA
- 21% of 2nd grade students are 2 grade levels below 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?

Contributing factors were student and staff attendance (40% of staff were absent 10 or more days; 45% of students were absent 10% or more days), lack of personnel consistency, teacher experience (18 teachers new to the school and/or teaching).

To address the staff attendance needs we have changed our staff arrival time from 7:00AM to 7:20AM. This will allow extra time for teachers who need to bring their children to daycare providers. Also, we will have a "Jeans Week" incentive for all staff members who receive perfect attendance the previous month. Additionally, staff members with perfect attendance for the month will be entered into a drawing. Last, we will recognize staff members with perfect attendance with an incentive at the end of the school year.

To address the student attendance needs we will have weekly leadership PLCs with the social worker, counselor, dean, intervention specialist, and administration to analyze attendance data and plan schoolwide/classroom/individual initiatives. During this time, we will identify students with high unexcused absences and create individualized plans. In addition, classes with perfect attendance will be recognized on the school news each week and tracked on an attendance bulletin board.

To address the teacher experience needs, we will continue the APPLES mentor program. In addition, we have planned a new teacher orientation before the start of school. Also, we have hired three additional academic coaches.

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

5th grade Science increased from 29% in 2020-2021 to 39% in 2021-2022.

3rd grade ELA Learning Gains increased from 14% in August 2021 to 69% on the 2021-2022 ELA FSA.

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

Science: adding a Science special area class to the master schedule and receiving district support.
3rd grade ELA LGs: smaller class sizes, support from academic coaches, and increased time in the ELA intervention blocks

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

ELA strategies: Training will be provided on the instructional cycle, the Decision Tree, and the ELA block models to all teachers during preschool week. ELA blocks are built into the master schedule and monitored by administration and academic coaches through checking lesson plans and conducting classroom walkthroughs. Walkthroughs will be conducted using "look-for" checklists to ensure fidelity of implementation. Walk-to-Read will be implemented K-3. Professional Development will be provided in High Yield Strategies.

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: High Yield strategies, academic coaching cycles, Kagan, district support in ELA/Math/Science, Teach Like a Champion book study and strategy videos.

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

We will have weekly leadership PLCs with the student support team (social worker, counselor, dean, intervention specialist, and administration) to analyze attendance data and plan schoolwide/classroom/individual initiatives. In addition, we will have weekly leadership PLCs with the academic coaching team. Coaches will have a schedule for walkthroughs, coaching, and student support.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and

Rationale:

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

2021-2022 ELA FSA:

- 27% ELA Proficiency
- 36% ELA Learning Gains
- 39% ELA L25 Learning Gains

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2021-2022, 27% of our 3rd-5th grade students were proficient in ELA. In 2022-2023, we will increase the ELA proficiency of our 3rd-5th grade students to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

- STAR
- Cambium
- iReady
- Standards based District Exemplars and Comprehensives
- DIBELS
- Access 2.0

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Diane Sherman (dianems@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

- coaching cycles

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

FSA 2022 data indicates a need to focus on proficiency and learning gains in ELA; after completing a gap analysis, results indicated a need in the area of coaching knowledge.

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.

Action Step # 1:

Grade level teams engage in planning with academic coaches.

District:

Provides the Instructional Guides
Provides Leading & Learning trainings

Admin:

Creates schedule for common team planning
creates an agenda for planning sessions
communicates expectations for team planning using the Instructional Guides
Checks lesson plans weekly

Coaches:

Reviews Instructional Guides prior to the planning meetings
Provides support and clarification during the planning process
Assists with resources

Teachers:

Meet weekly with team to review Instructional Guides

Preview texts as a team

Adapt the Instructional Guides to address school/class/individual needs

Person Responsible

Diane Sherman (dianems@leeschools.net)

Action Step #2:

Coaching teachers on delivering differentiated interventions

District:

provide support to academic coaches
schedule and implement trainings
conduct semesterly walk-about

Admin:

master schedule allows for consistent frequency of grade level content area planning
create a daily schedule for academic coaches
define roles and responsibilities of team members
collaborate with academic coaches bi-weekly
analyze "look-for" data provided by academic coaches
clearly communicate the expectations for planning with coaches and teachers at Manatee

Coaches:

create "look-for" checklists
conduct walkthroughs
meet with teachers before and after walk throughs to provide feedback and develop action plans

Teachers:

Utilize the "look-fors" when planning for instruction
engage in common planning with grade level team and academic coach
prepare differentiated lesson plans for small group instruction
collaborate with academic coach

Person Responsible

Diane Sherman (dianems@leeschools.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

Area of Focus: Implementation of effective instructional practices of classroom teachers relating to ELA. Teachers will be provided with professional development, coaching, and planning support to increase our ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains.

% of students not on track to score a Level 3:

Kindergarten: 30%

1st Grade: 53%

2nd Grade: 64%

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

Area of Focus: Implementation of effective instructional practices of classroom teachers relating to ELA. Teachers will be provided with professional development, coaching, and planning support to increase our ELA proficiency and ELA learning gains.

% of students not on track to score a Level 3:

3rd Grade: 75%

4th Grade: 75%

5th Grade: 72%

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)

In 2021-2022, 70% of our Kindergarten students were proficient in ELA as measured by iReady. By end of year 2022-2023, we will increase the ELA proficiency of our Kindergarten students to 73%.

In 2021-2022, 41% of our 1st and 2nd grade students were proficient in ELA as measured by iReady. By end of year 2022-2023, we will increase the ELA proficiency of our 1st and 2nd grade students to 45%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2021-2022, 27% of our 3rd-5th grade students were proficient in ELA. In 2022-2023, we will increase the ELA proficiency of our 3rd-5th grade students to 45%.

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.

We will use iReady, STAR, Cambium, Dibels, and district assessments to monitor student learning.

Monitoring

District:

Feedback during planning sessions

Quantitative data conducted during walkabouts

iReady data

district assessment data (Dibbels, exemplars, quarterly comprehensives)

Admin:

Review planning agenda

Review of lesson plans

Classroom walkthroughs

iReady data

district assessment data (Dibbels, exemplars, quarterly comprehensives)

Coaches:

Notes taken during the planning sessions

Classroom walkthroughs/"look for" data

classroom assessment data reviewed at planning session

Teachers:

Lesson plans reflect differentiated small group learning

teacher is observed purposely implementing the look-fors

classroom assessment data reviewed in preparation for planning session

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sherman, Diane, dianems@leeschools.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

-B.E.S.T. Standards curriculum (Wonders K-5)
 -Phonics curriculum (Really Great Reading K-2)
 -Intervention curriculum (ReadWell, FlyLeaf, Ready Reading)
 -ESOL program (Imagine Learning)
 -Strategic academic coaching
 -Additional instruction through tutoring (PE waiver groups, after school tutoring)

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 curriculum and reading plan has been chosen by the district based on research. The ELA core curriculum (Wonders) is a comprehensive standards based program and provides resources for differentiation. After using diagnostic testing and the Decision tree, the supplemental programs will support the needs of students who are one or two years below grade level.

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
<p>District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide support to academic coaches schedule and implement trainings conduct semesterly walk-about <p>Admin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> master schedule allows for consistent frequency of grade level content area planning create a daily schedule for academic coaches define roles and responsibilities of team members collaborate with academic coaches bi-weekly analyze “look-for” data provided by academic coaches clearly communicate the expectations for planning with coaches and teachers at Manatee <p>Coaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> create “look-for” checklists conduct walkthroughs meet with teachers before and after walk throughs to provide feedback and develop action plans <p>Teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize the “look-fors” when planning for instruction engage in common planning with grade level team and academic coach prepare differentiated lesson plans for small group instruction 	<p>Sherman, Diane, dianems@leeschools.net</p>

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 PBiS program provides schoolwide expectations and rewards using the S.T.A.R. acronym.

- S- show respect
- T- treat others kindly
- A- always be safe
- R- reach for the stars.

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

PBiS team consisting of the School Counselor, ESE representative, classroom teachers and administration.