

St. Lucie Public Schools

Manatee Academy K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Manatee Academy K 8

1450 SW HEATHERWOOD BLVD, Port St Lucie, FL 34986

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/man/>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/10/2023.

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 mission of Manatee Academy is to ensure all students graduate from a safe and caring school, equipped with the knowledge, skills, and desire to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Academy, in partnership with parents and community, will become a premier center of knowledge that emphasizes organized around students and the work provided to them. Manatee Academy's name will be synonymous with continuously improving student achievement and the success of each individual. Our school's promise is to move from good to great focusing on our core business, the creation of challenging, engaging and satisfying work for each student, every day. This is the St. Lucie Way!

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
Walukiewicz, Kerri	Principal	
Gascoigne, Patricia	Assistant Principal	
James, Kirsten	Assistant Principal	
Piscopo, Samantha	Assistant Principal	
Montoya, Dawn	School Counselor	
Jerome, Janet	School Counselor	
Herrera, Vanessa	School Counselor	
Davis, Chad	Reading Coach	
Ankrom, Ashley	Math Coach	
Rosado, Cassie	Other	
Cox, Donald	Other	
Benulis, Kara	Dean	
Jensen, Kristen	Other	
Youhana, Dawn	Other	
Hayes, Patrice	Other	
Wallman, Dawn	Dean	

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.

The school leadership team has weekly meetings to discuss data, goals and progress towards goals. SIP goals, data and progress are all shared monthly with Faculty Council and SAC. The SIP is presented to stakeholders for input and transparency.

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 goals will be monitored by the leadership team and discussed in our weekly meetings. Each goal will have multiple staff members assisting with the implementation and monitoring of action steps to ensure progress towards the SIP goals. Action steps include progress monitoring points which will drive any necessary revisions to action steps.

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)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	69%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	67%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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: B

	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
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	46	41	36	33	35	39	63	68	364	
One or more suspensions	0	6	8	6	10	11	24	67	25	157	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	16	28	23	1	9	0	30	8	115	
Course failure in Math	0	13	31	40	0	8	1	21	29	143	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	32	10	10	37	39	69	85	61	343	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	42	23	52	28	32	76	52	55	360	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	29	37	46	57	56	77	87	81	473	

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	1	52	51	61	47	46	82	118	89	547

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	4	4	12	0	0	0	0	2	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	42	37	50	33	31	43	66	82	79	463	
One or more suspensions	3	3	7	5	12	25	43	54	58	210	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	10	5	23	40	1	89	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	10	3	38	40	1	99	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	39	45	43	78	61	267	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	33	63	67	76	41	302	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	5	2	8	4	5	0	0	0	28	

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	4	4	5	20	34	58	73	104	71	373

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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	42	37	50	33	31	43	66	82	79	463	
One or more suspensions	3	3	7	5	12	25	43	54	58	210	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	10	10	5	23	40	1	89	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	10	3	38	40	1	99	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	39	45	43	78	61	267	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	33	63	67	76	41	302	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	5	2	8	4	5	0	0	0	28	

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	4	4	5	20	34	58	73	104	71	373

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	3	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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*	50	50	53	52	53	55	52		
ELA Learning Gains				53			54		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			42		
Math Achievement*	58	51	55	54	41	42	53		
Math Learning Gains				57			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			50		
Science Achievement*	50	52	52	44	50	54	50		
Social Studies Achievement*	81	71	68	71	55	59	72		
Middle School Acceleration	96	75	70	85	50	51	77		
Graduation Rate		90	74		50	50			
College and Career Acceleration		69	53		74	70			
ELP Progress	42	44	55	56	78	70	71		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	27	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	53			
BLK	59			
HSP	58			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	71			

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%
FRL	58			

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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	56			
HSP	52			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	55			

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	50			58			50	81	96			42
SWD	22			25			11	55			6	25
ELL	24			37			31	76			6	43
AMI												
ASN	53			53							2	
BLK	44			54			42	78	94		7	43
HSP	48			55			48	80	94		7	42
MUL	55			66			57	93			5	

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
PAC												
WHT	57			65			59	84	100		6	
FRL	45			54			45	78	96		7	42

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	52	53	45	54	57	53	44	71	85			56
SWD	19	42	41	22	42	38	22	41				42
ELL	27	39	35	31	48	40	14	38				56
AMI												
ASN	61	74		61	80							
BLK	45	51	45	49	61	58	30	67	100			50
HSP	48	51	40	49	54	51	39	56	78			57
MUL	60	64		57	50		50	92				
PAC												
WHT	59	55	51	61	55	48	54	85	82			
FRL	46	49	43	49	56	56	39	72	80			59

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	52	54	42	53	54	50	50	72	77			71
SWD	19	33	32	24	43	44	24	48				44
ELL	30	51	57	33	60	59	25	59				72
AMI												
ASN	70	75		58	50							
BLK	42	45	36	44	46	46	39	62	72			61
HSP	51	57	41	53	59	56	49	64	80			76
MUL	70	50		60	50		61					
PAC												
WHT	57	57	48	59	58	51	56	81	77			
FRL	49	51	41	49	52	50	43	68	71			68

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	47%	46%	1%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	48%	43%	5%	47%	1%
08	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	47%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	52%	4%	58%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	42%	0%	47%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	42%	8%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	54%	0%
07	2023 - Spring	53%	38%	15%	48%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	56%	10%	61%	5%
08	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	55%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	55%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	44%	41%	3%	44%	0%
05	2023 - Spring	51%	47%	4%	51%	0%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	34%	64%	50%	48%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	66%	12%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 6th grade ELA. This group performed at only 44% proficiency. This was below the school average of 49.6% proficient. This cohort of students was in 3rd grade in the 19 20 SY in which the retention laws were suspended. Since then, this cohort has been showing a trend in underperforming.

The 22 23 school year was the first full year of BEST Standards implementation. Prior to that there was a larger focus on the previous LAFS Standards.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA. We dropped in proficiency from the 21 22 SY (52%) to the 22 23 SY (49.6%).

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.

The greatest gap between the school and the state was in 5th grade mathematics. The State had 55% L3 or above as compared to 47% proficient at Manatee. The prior year, 21 22, the same cohort of students had 57% proficiency. This is a drop in proficiency.

On a positive trend, 5th grade team departmentalizes and had a teacher new to Manatee teaching math in the 22 23 SY. The proficiency of the grade in 21 22 was 44% and increased to 55% for the 22 23 SY.

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

The data area that showed the most improvement was our Acceleration Cell with Algebra.

In the 21 22 SY we had 85% proficient. In the 22 23 SY we had 98% proficient. Teachers focused on the critical content of the standards and provided students with multiple opportunities to practice the application of the skill through computer-based learning. Small group and differentiated/individual instruction were also implemented.

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

Based on EWS data, our attendance is an area of concern. We have over 20% of our population missing 10% or more of the school year. Absences directly impact students ability to perform on grade level and/or make learning gains.

Another area of concern is 473, over 27% of our students have a reading deficiency. The number of

students with reading deficiencies increases as the grade levels rise. This indicates that the learning gap for reading continues to increase each year.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. ELA Learning Gains/L25 Learning Gains
3. Math Proficiency
4. Math Learning Gains/L25 Learning
5. Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Our ELL Students are performing below the 41% proficiency.

In 21-22 ELL students scored 27% proficient as compared to All students who scored 52% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELL goal is to be at 42 % proficient for ELL this year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through PM1 and 2, Unit Assessments, iReady/Success Maker. Grade levels will have data meetings to look at and monitor data in relation to goals in order to adjust instruction and interventions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Patricia Gascoigne (patricia.gascoigne@stlucieschools.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.)

Identified students in Middle School that are performing below grade level are in an intensive reading class.

MTSS - Benchmark Advance Intervention Kits, Reading Horizon, iReady, Imagine Learning

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be given tiered and monitored additional support along with their grade level instruction.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

An area of focus is to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers.

At the end of the 22 23 SY

4 Teachers Retired

11 Teachers Transferred Schools

3 Teachers accepted positions for advancement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to retain 90% of our instructional staff this year. There is a heavy focus on Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) and teacher retention helps this process run smoothly as teams work better over time. This increases capacity and knowledge of the grade levels which translates to higher student achievement.

Monitoring:

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

The principal sends out weekly surveys to teachers to assess teacher need and to get a read on teacher culture.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Piscopo (samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.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.)

Teacher Focus Groups

Faculty Council

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers need opportunity to share concerns and voices in a variety of platforms.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Our SWD are performing below the 41% proficiency.

In 21-22 SWD scored 19% proficient as compared to All students who scored 52% proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD goal is to be at 42 % proficient for ELL this year.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through PM1 and 2, Unit Assessments, iReady/Success Maker. Grade levels will have data meetings to look at and monitor data in relation to goals in order to adjust instruction and interventions as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Samantha Piscopo (samantha.piscopo@stlucieschools.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.)

Identified students in Middle School that are performing below grade level are in an intensive reading class.

MTSS - Benchmark Advance Intervention Kits, Reading Horizon, iReady

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will be given tiered and monitored additional support along with their grade level instruction.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Data was used to determine that we needed an additional interventionist for ELA.

We worked with district curriculum to help determine the best resources to purchase to assist with interventions.

We work closely with Title 1 and our school coordinator to plan events for parent involvement, so parents have up to date information as well as as voice in the school.

We work with SAC to present data and discuss best practices for closing gaps

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Our area of focus in K-2 is to increase grade level proficiency in fluency and comprehension. This will allow students to enter the next grade level with the necessary skills to continue to progress.

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

Our area of focus in 3-5 is to increase grade level proficiency as well as show at least 1 year of learning gains in ELA. We currently have all grades with at least 50% of students scoring proficient.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

We expect to see an increase in the number of students scoring proficient in ELA according to STAR data.

We expect to see a minimum of 60% of students scoring proficient by PM3.

We expect to see 100% of students make learning gains from PM1 - PM 3

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

We expect to see an increase in the number of students scoring proficient in ELA according to FAST Data.

We expect to see a minimum number of 60 % of students scoring proficient by PM3.

We expect to see 100% of students make learning gains from PM1 - PM 3

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Monitoring will be completed through PM testing, UA, iReady and My Path data.

Data will be reviewed quarterly to assess student need and next steps.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Davis, Chad, chad.davis@stlucieschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

Teachers will be using the district adopted Savvas curriculum and following the district calendar.
Teachers will be using My Path Imagine Learning
Students performing below grade level are in Intensive Reading

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

These evidence based programs address the needs of students. They are working with grade level standards as well as prior standards that they have not masterd.

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**

Teachers will participate in weekly Collaborate Learning with the Literacy Coach. Teachers look at the critical content of the standards and create lesson plans for whole group and small group instruction. Teachers will plan using Savvas, iReady and My Path.

Davis, Chad,
chad.davis@stlucieschools.org

Teachers will participate in Data Meetings following each PM test and each Unit Assessment. Teachers will analyze data to determine student performance regarding proficiency and learning gains. Teachers will analyze data to determine reteaching, small group and My Path assignments.

Gascoigne, Patricia,
patricia.gascoigne@stlucieschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be shared with Faculty Council and SAC. Each monthly meeting will include a review of goals, data and progress in relation to the SIP. Stakeholders in both groups are given monthly breakdowns of progress monitoring data and how that data is used to make instructional and structural decisions.

Once published, the SIP will be made available on our website.

A SIP review session will also be available at our first Title I night.

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/man/>

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

A FORMS Survey is sent out to parents to gather information on which days/times work the best for family engagement activities. The Survey also asks parents what types of activities, information they would like. These surveys will be available at all family engagement activities to continue to collect data. At each event there will be an evaluation form to collect feedback. Manatee Academy will offer a variety of parent and family engagement events to strengthen its school-home partnership and to involve the community in students' education, including curriculum events, recognition events, and information sessions. Title I funds have been allotted for teachers to plan, prepare, and facilitate parent and family engagement activities throughout the year. Examples include trivia/game nights, data sessions, and themed curriculum events. These in-person events will be focused on subject area standards/content and will support learning at home. A Calendar of events will be sent home to families at the beginning of the year. Flyers will be sent 2 weeks before each event and posted on the school website. A connect Ed call/ Text reminder will be sent 1 week before each event. • Parents will have the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the Parent and Family Engagement Policy/Plan at the end of the academic year.

<https://schools.stlucie.k12.fl.us/man/>

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

There will be a heavy focus on collaborative learning and planning (CLP) and teacher and student understanding of critical content this year. Administration and coaches will attend and support CLPs. Admin will monitor instructional delivery through classroom walkthroughs and provide teachers with timely feedback in relation to critical content of the standard, instructional delivery and monitoring of

student understanding. Admin will use this data to plan and provide professional development for teachers based on need. In the 22 23 SY Manatee Academy offered Alg I to 7th graders. This allows us to offer Geometry in the 23 24 SY for the first time. We will continue this year with another cohort of 7th graders in Alg I. In the 23 24 SY Manatee Academy is also beginning AMP (Accelerated Math Program) in 3rd grade and will continue to build onto that in subsequent years. The Rtl blocks will be staggered this year in order to increase the number of staff available each block, This will allow for smaller groups and more targeted interventions.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The SIP is designed to meet the academic, behavioral, social and emotional needs of all students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Each grade level is assigned a counselor, a dean and an administrator in order to ensure smooth educational and behavioral transitions throughout the school years.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

Manatee Academy offers a CTE Vet Prep program for our 6th graders. This program will continue to progress each year to eventually become a 3 year program.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The Response to Intervention Behavior Team meets to analyze student behavior and determine any necessary interventions for students. They also monitor interventions to ensure that they are effective and beneficial to the student. The deans present discipline data to the leadership team each week. This data determines if students need to be referred to the RtIB team as well as if staff needs professional learning with classroom management.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers participate in Collaborative Learning and Planning (CLP) cycles each week with content coaches. The focus of the CLPs is to identify critical content from the standard, plan lessons using best practice instructional strategies and analyze data to determine student mastery. We also offer voluntary PD throughout the year based on teacher need, school wide focus, teacher interest and classroom walkthroughs.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Kindergarten families are provided with Learning Kits that have 6 weeks of educational activities that families can work on over the summer. The kits provide detailed info and explanations of each learning activity that will help students make a successful transition to kindergarten.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes