

Brevard Public Schools

Manatee Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Manatee Elementary School

3425 VIERA BLVD, Viera, FL 32940

<http://www.manatee.brevard.k12.fl.us>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 9/6/2023.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Manatee Elementary School community will design quality learning experiences; fostering an environment of high academic and character standards. (Rev. 19/20)

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Manatee Elementary School community strives to create a nurturing environment which will empower students to meet the challenges of the future. (Rev. 19/20)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Daly, Shannon	Principal	<p>Mrs. Daly is present every day welcoming families, collaborating with educators and leaders in her building, and observing and participating in classroom experiences. Celebrating the school's twentieth year, she credits evident advance planning for the strength and success of the school. Her annual themes are well selected based on her careful analysis of survey results from all stakeholders as well as academic data analysis. Her communication methods are routine and informational in a multitude of platforms. Professional development is intentional and purposeful. Mrs. Daly also manages the day-to-day operations such as our budget, facilities, personnel/employment needs, and business support to help us reach our annual goals.</p>
Larkin, Lisa	Assistant Principal	<p>Ms. Larkin oversees Manatee's district and state assessments preparing schedules, materials, technology, teachers, and students to be ready for these protocols and expectations. Student behavioral concerns are addressed immediately, involving parents and following through with our guidance department in critical situations. State, district, and school assessment calendars are prioritized and organization is established in advance to meet the needs of our students with accommodations. Ms. Larkin works with district and staff to ensure Manatee has the materials necessary for instruction, and is our Induction and Mentor Program coordinator.</p>
Mellott, Jaki	Assistant Principal	<p>Mrs. Mellott-Grajera supports school and district initiatives and coordinates professional development schedules and agendas. A positive culture is crucial to our success and student and staff positive mental health. This is supported by our three tier approach to learning, emotional growth, and executive function. Mrs. Grajera oversees our ESOL Program, strives to build our daily student attendance working closely with families, and is our Title IX contact. She works closely with our teachers on technology platform understanding, curriculum development, and instructional practices that match the B.E.S.T. standards.</p>
Coffin, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	<p>Mrs. Coffin is an established educator and is serving as our School Advisory Council Chairperson. She sets our calendar, oversees elections and membership processes, organizes our meeting agendas, and is the lead communicator with the members of our team. Mrs. Coffin keeps abreast of district and state SAC rules and policies and ensures Manatee Elementary meets state expectations and due dates.</p>
Kellam, Maurica	Instructional Coach	<p>Mrs. Kellam is instrumental in helping research and purchase materials that our staff can utilize professionally for their instructional practices or with students for intervention purposes. She serves as our Instructional Coach and has positively established a very successful weekly Professional Learning Community routine at Manatee. Mrs. Kellam collaborates with teams to analyze data and instruction and to set intervention plans in action. She also serves as an instructor for many of our professional development experiences such as helping our teachers meet</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the Reading Endorsement requirements. She is an exceptional support system for both new and seasoned teachers.
Robinette, Priscilla	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Robinette serves in the capacity of Manatee Elementary's Co-Chair of our School Advisory Council. She assists Mrs. Coffin with the implementation of following state and district protocols for SAC teams. She is a leader among our instructional staff as well and is a fourth grade teacher that works closely with our ESE staff to meet the needs of all students she serves.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders include our students, their families, our instructional staff members, school advisory council, PTO, and all of our support staff. Feedback is regularly sought from all groups and data are closely reviewed and analyzed to set new goals for improvement. Google surveys are a quick way to gather small amounts of information to be able to utilize immediately and move forward with goals with input from those that initiatives affect.

Manatee administration takes time to look closely and reflect on commentary received from a variety of sources. The annual Insight Survey, Parent Survey, and Youth Truth Surveys are analyzed thoroughly to determine areas for improvement and stronger commitment in upcoming months and years. Surveys are promoted dramatically to contribute to result validity. Sharing out results with staff and community celebrates areas of success and builds commitment to areas of opportunity. This creates a sense of trust and commitment among leadership and our constituencies.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is reviewed quarterly with both staff and SAC. The SIP guides site-based decision making and assessment data are used to determine effectiveness of implementation. As the year progresses, formative assessment is used to identify areas of strength and opportunity for academic goals and Focus data are used to track culture goal initiatives.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	26%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	20%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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	
Absent 10% or more days	3	13	8	5	5	2	7	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	7	2	2	0	2	3	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	10	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	0	0	8

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	33	32	22	27	26	27	25	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	9	4	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	7	7	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	8	4	8	2	0	0	29	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	33	32	22	27	26	27	25	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	9	4	0	0	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	3	7	7	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	3	4	8	4	8	2	0	0	29	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	81	58	53	86	61	56	84		
ELA Learning Gains				78			77		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			60		
Math Achievement*	85	58	59	89	49	50	85		
Math Learning Gains				85			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				77			66		
Science Achievement*	81	58	54	82	60	59	80		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59				64		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	326
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	81
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	566
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL	63			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	71			
HSP	76			
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	64			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	56			
ELL	87			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	93			
HSP	85			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	76			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	81			85			81					
SWD	40			48			50				4	
ELL	53			73							2	
AMI												
ASN	78			89							2	
BLK	78			63							2	
HSP	70			79							3	
MUL	80			80			82				3	
PAC												
WHT	83			88			85				4	
FRL	61			71			68				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	86	78	69	89	85	77	82					
SWD	54	65	64	60	66	58	26					
ELL	80	92		93	83							
AMI												
ASN	87	60		100	80							
BLK	89	86		96	100							
HSP	83	84		88	88		83					
MUL	89	69		87	77		80					
PAC												
WHT	86	79	66	89	84	76	81					
FRL	80	70	67	81	81	76	75					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	84	77	60	85	71	66	80					64
SWD	45	63	52	53	60	60	43					
ELL	59	70		82	80							64
AMI												
ASN	87	82		100	91							
BLK	73	64		76	57							
HSP	82	70		81	80							
MUL	88	72		82	68		89					
PAC												
WHT	85	79	59	86	70	68	81					
FRL	77	76	72	76	67	61	76					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	59%	20%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	58%	30%
06	2023 - Spring	77%	61%	16%	47%	30%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	56%	23%	50%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	89%	67%	22%	54%	35%
03	2023 - Spring	85%	60%	25%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	92%	61%	31%	61%	31%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	55%	27%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	57%	23%	51%	29%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Year after year, Manatee consistently outperforms both district and state results. Two years ago, we took on an ELA textbook adoption. While the typical J curve is expected at the inception of any new materials pivot, it is still concerning that our students have shown little or flat growth in ELA from year to year. An increased focus last year on ethnicity subgroups produced growth consistent with that of non-ethnic subgroups. Acceleration through targeted Academic Support Programs and an increased focus on RTI and the MTSS process has helped to maintain learning gains for those students "on the bubble." Still, students with disabilities continue to perform significantly lower than their nondisabled peers in both ELA and 5th grade science. One contributing factor may be the historic scheduling of services during the science block. Another contributing factor may be the low performance in ELA vocabulary strand data. An overall interesting trend is the slow, but consistent growth of our FRL population. In 20-21, it was 16.2%, jumping to 18.2% in 21-22, additionally growing to 19.1% in 22-23. The year before our current cohort of 6th graders started kindergarten, our FRL population was 12.1%; we begin the 23-24 school year with 20%.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

One subject area that concerns us greatly is our declining performance and growth in 5th grade Science, with Achievement scores moving from 92% proficiency for the 15-16 school year to 80% proficient. During the 22-23 school year, Florida assessment changed dramatically from a summative, one-time paper and pencil state test in 21-22 to a computer-based progress monitoring model with 3 opportunities throughout the year to demonstrate growth. While it is difficult to compare year over year because of assessment model change, closely examining ELA cohort data reveals that both our current fourth (50%) and fifth grade (65%) cohorts struggled with the Genre/Vocabulary strand with 50% and 65% respectively above the standard. This decline coincides with the second year that our current reading series was in place. It also coincides with fifth grade students' initial experience with departmentalization-through fourth grade, students at Manatee learn in a self contained environment. Our current 6th grade presents our greatest area of decline, with 86% proficient in 21-22, falling to 79% in 22-23. The area of most difficulty was in the Poetry and Prose strand, with only 49% above the standard, followed by the Genre/Vocabulary strand, with 67% above the standard.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Manatee Elementary outperformed both the state and district percentages. In third grade, 79% were proficient in ELA and 85% proficient in math. In fourth grade, 88% were proficient in ELA and 92% were proficient in math. In fifth grade, 79% were proficient in ELA and 81% were proficient in math. Last year's 6th grade has all moved on to middle school. While science proficiency improved slightly to 80%, it is still a concern to us because of its relative stagnant response to increased focus. Possibly contributing to this might be limited vocabulary growth in ELA.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Manatee's math proficiency was a cause for celebration. In addition to a guaranteed, viable curricular series adoption that focused on mathematical thinking processes, Manatee shifted to administration monitoring of i-Ready data that directed Response to Intervention groupings. Common formative and summative assessments guided teachers as they planned out each quarter. The active role of a district math coach provided teachers with a sounding board as they embraced new and more rigorous pacing documents.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Last year, we reduced our number of students who had less than 90% attendance rate from 192 in the 21-22 school year to 43 in 22-23. This contributes to lessened course failure in Math and ELA, but appears to be a dramatic contributor to a reduction in the number of substantially deficient readers from 29 in the 21-22 school year to 0 in 22-23. An area of concern is a significant increase in the number of students suspended one or more times from 2 in 21-22 to 16 in 22-23.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increased grade 5 Science proficiency through intentional use of Penda
2. Increased proficiency in Reading Across Genres and Vocabulary for lowest 25% through acceleration and small group instruction
3. Increased understanding of behavior MTSS to reduce suspensions

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Though Manatee Elementary increased their SSS Science Assessment proficiency level percentage to 80% from 79% the prior year, it is the academic content area with our lowest percentage score. Realizing the extent at which Manatee teachers have focused their attention on reading and math over the past few years, it is apparent we must continue to prioritize our science instructional content and include science data analysis in our bi- weekly curriculum grade level meetings.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Manatee will monitor our fifth-grade science Penda SSA Review opportunities and share results with all teachers at a monthly scheduled PLC for science data review. By creating a visual representation of the concepts' occurrence in lower grade level planning for instruction, we will use data collected to target the 2023 SSS Science Assessment results. Our goal will be an increase in our school's proficiency rating to from 80% to 86% of our students earning a 3 or above on the 2024 Science state assessment. For students with disabilities, we will increase proficiency levels from 26% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

During the scheduled assessment windows, the district Penda SSS Review exams will be used with 5th grade students to obtain data for analysis in our PLC meetings. Penda exit tickets administered at each grade level will be monitored for performance on specific content addressed in their standards at monthly PLCs. Pacing schedules will be followed with fidelity. Classroom walkthroughs by administration will be prioritized during science instruction and positive and encouraging feedback will be provided assisting with strategy suggestions if necessary. PLC agendas for grade level meetings will focus on Penda formative and summative assessments to identify instructional strengths as well as considerations for future Professional Development needs. Our science lab teacher will lead PLCs and plan regular opportunities for students to engage in hands-on learning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Manatee administration will continue to promote the strengthening of the 5E Model of Instruction and integration of Penda formative and summative assessments to guide Tier 1 instruction in science. This carefully planned sequence of instruction places students at the center of learning and data at the center of progression.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The 5E Model of Instruction encourages all students to explore, construct understanding of scientific concepts, and relate those understandings to phenomena or engineering problems. The use of Penda data to guide instruction increases student engagement during science instruction and provides additional resources for our teachers to incorporate into their craft. This data will also guide our professional development planning.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Well-structured plan for classroom observations during science instruction to provide encouragement and support to our teachers regarding their Tier 1 methods utilizing the 5E Model of Instruction while ensuring the district pacing guides are being followed with fidelity (Daly, Larkin, Grajera – Administrative Team)

Person Responsible: Shannon Daly (daly.shannon@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 1, 2023

Professional Development opportunity for formative and summative PENDA exit tickets to track progress on SSA content topics (Alexis Bergevin, Science Lab Teacher, Jaki Mellott-Grajera, AP)

Person Responsible: Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 1, 2023

Well-organized staff development experiences during PDD days and PLC meetings--including prerequisite standard review of 3rd and 4th grade standards tested on end of year assessment (Shannon Daly)

Person Responsible: Shannon Daly (daly.shannon@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 1, 2023

Data Analysis processes of identification of grade level content that supports 5th grade SSA success and discussion opportunities for teams of teachers (Alexis Bergevin, Science Lab Teacher, Maurica Kellam, Instructional Coach, Jaki Grajera, Administration)

Person Responsible: Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

By When: November 1, 2023

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Reducing suspensions is an important and complex goal for any school, as it directly impacts student success, school climate, and the overall learning environment. A reduction in suspensions contributes to fostering a positive and inclusive school climate. When students feel safe, respected, and valued, they are more likely to engage in learning, form positive relationships, and thrive academically.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Manatee will reduce the total number of students who are suspended out of school by 25% from 16 to 12 by the end of the academic year. This data-based objective provides a clear benchmark for progress and allows for effective evaluation of our school's efforts to achieve the broader goal of creating a more positive and inclusive learning environment.

Monitoring:

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

Creating the expectation for daily social-emotional instruction as a universal support and the development of a systemic and systematic program for targeted and intensive interventions will be monitored through teacher self-assessment, regular classroom walkthroughs, and evidence of a focus on communicating, teaching, and reteaching schoolwide expectations. Data from these sources will drive Professional development opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

By combining social-emotional instruction with a three-tiered approach to behavior management, Manatee will create a comprehensive system that not only addresses immediate behavioral issues but also focuses on long-term growth, emotional well-being, and overall positive school culture. This holistic approach is likely to result in fewer suspensions and a more inclusive learning environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that students who are suspended are more likely to experience academic setbacks, drop out of school, and even enter the juvenile justice system. Reducing suspensions can help break this cycle and lead to better long-term outcomes for students. Suspending students often removes them from the learning environment without addressing the underlying behavioral issues. By implementing alternative disciplinary strategies, Manatee can better support students' social-emotional development and teach them appropriate conflict resolution skills.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Identification of students who are at risk of behavioral challenges and provide more targeted support, such as counseling, mentoring, or small group interventions.

Person Responsible: Lisa Larkin (larkin.lisa@brevardschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Implementation and professional development aimed at teaching students how to identify and manage their emotions that leads to better decision-making and reduces impulsive behavior, decreasing the likelihood of situations escalating to suspension-worthy incidents.

Person Responsible: Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

By When: Preplanning week

Designing, promoting, and implementing suspension alternatives that create opportunities for restorative justice, fostering a more empathetic and supportive school community. (Jaki Grajera in conjunction with school counselors)

Person Responsible: Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

By When: February 1, 2024

For students with persistent and severe behavioral issues, develop innovative intensive support through individualized behavior plans that leverages counseling and the involvement of families and external professionals to address the root causes of behavior.

Person Responsible: Lisa Larkin (larkin.lisa@brevardschools.org)

By When: February 1, 2024

ongoing MTSS training for admin to prepare regular staff professional development in behavior management to be delivered through PLC, staff meetings, or email communications.

Person Responsible: Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

By When: ongoing until May, 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus for our school improvement plan is to enhance instructional practices in English Language Arts (ELA) with a specific emphasis on vocabulary development. This initiative aims to improve students' vocabulary acquisition and usage across all grade levels, fostering stronger language skills and comprehension abilities. Rationale: Vocabulary is a fundamental component of language and literacy development. Proficient vocabulary skills are critical for comprehension, communication, and academic success across subjects.

A robust vocabulary enhances reading comprehension, writing quality, and effective communication, which are vital life skills. Improving vocabulary instruction will align with Florida's educational goals, including BEST State Standards, to ensure students are well-prepared for standardized assessments and college and career readiness.

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 school year, we aim to increase the 3-5 FAST vocabulary strand scores for the 4th grade cohort from 50% above proficient to 65%, and 5th grade from 65% above proficient to 75%. Overall ELA proficiency for students with disabilities in grades 3-6 will increase from 54% above proficiency to 64%.

Monitoring:

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

Regular assessments and progress tracking will be conducted throughout the year to monitor the improvement in vocabulary skills. This will include pre- and post-assessments, classroom observations, and periodic teacher and student feedback sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Direct Instruction: Teachers will provide explicit vocabulary instruction, introducing and reinforcing new words regularly.

Contextual Learning: Vocabulary will be taught in context, ensuring students understand word usage and meaning within the context of reading and writing.

Word Games and Activities: Engaging activities like word games, word walls, and vocabulary digital apps will be used to make learning enjoyable.

Integration into Curriculum: Vocabulary instruction will be integrated into all ELA lessons and across other subject areas to promote cross-disciplinary language development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using evidence-based instruction is crucial to ensure that our efforts are grounded in proven methods. Penda, Iready, Lexia, and Imagine learning and literacy has demonstrated success in improving vocabulary skills among students in various educational settings. By adhering to this program, we can have confidence in its effectiveness and its ability to yield positive outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Assessment and Baseline Data: Teachers assess the current vocabulary levels of students across grade levels to establish a baseline through iReady. Using a combination of standardized formative assessments enables teachers to track progress.

Person Responsible: Maurica Kellam (kellam.maurica@brevardschools.org)

By When: September, 2023

Professional Development: Provide professional development opportunities for teachers to enhance their understanding of effective vocabulary instruction strategies. This includes PLCs, coaching, and access to instructional resources.

Person Responsible: Maurica Kellam (kellam.maurica@brevardschools.org)

By When: January, 2024

Curriculum Integration: Ensure the expected integration of vocabulary instruction into the existing Benchmark ELA curriculum, aligning with BEST state standards and curriculum frameworks. Ensure teachers are aware of vocabulary-building curricular resources and materials. Admin walk throughs

Person Responsible: Lisa Larkin (larkin.lisa@brevardschools.org)

By When: January, 2024

Regular Monitoring and Feedback: Utilize the current iReady system for ongoing progress monitoring and feedback. Conduct regular grade level meetings to review assessment data, observe classroom instruction, and gather feedback from teachers and students.

Person Responsible: Shannon Daly (daly.shannon@brevardschools.org)

By When: ongoing until May, 2024

Parent and Community Engagement: Involve parents and the community in supporting vocabulary development at home. Provide resources and workshops for parents to reinforce vocabulary skills outside of school.

Person Responsible: Jaki Mellott (mellott.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

By When: March, 2024