

Manatee County Public Schools

Parrish Charter Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Parrish Charter Academy

8605 ERIE RD, Parrish, FL 34219

www.pcaedu.org

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 Parrish Charter Academy (PCA) is to provide academic excellence for all students through experience and self-discovery in order to develop motivated, independently thinking individuals who demonstrate exemplary character, social confidence and service to the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

PCA embraces the vision of being a school community that actively cultivates innovation and integrity in a challenging and engaging learning environment that ensures academic and social-emotional success.

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
Patterson, Dawn	Principal	Oversee School operations; academics, behavior, before and afterschool activities, maintenance, transportation, personnel, and required school district documents. Provides a common vision for decision making. Ensures the school implements MTSS, provides guidance and support for effective instruction. Ensures staff complies with standards.

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 Leadership Team members, Dawn Patterson (Principal), Julia Dawson (Asst. Principal), Nicole Ferretti (Assistant Principal), Nikki Baylis (Student Services), Donna Ferner (ESE Director), Grade Level Team Leaders, Parrish Charter Academy Friends and Family Association (PCAFFA), Student Leadership (Middle School Leaders and now NJHS). Stakeholders discuss data, classroom strategies to implement student engagement and small group instruction, and shared values that include the culture of school.

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))

We will be conducting classroom walkthroughs (daily/weekly), student progress monitoring(varies), common planning minutes/input (weekly), staff feedback (monthly), parental and community input (monthly). Data chats will be conducted on a monthly basis, with more frequent check-ins for our Tier 2 and 3 students. Data is collected for Tier 2 students every 2 weeks and Tier 3 will be every week. After 6 weeks of interventions, the leadership team will meet to discuss data and determine if progress is adequate enough. If not, the team will determine other interventions that may need to be implemented.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C
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	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	8	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	0	8	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	2	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	12	17	9	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	16	20	15	0	0	62	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	2	10	8	10	4	0	0	38	
	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	2	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	8	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	0	8	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	2	2	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	5	0	1	1	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	18	12	17	9	0	0	56	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	16	20	15	0	0	62	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	2	10	8	10	4	0	0	38	

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	2	0	0	2	0	2	3	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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*	51	48	53	57	50	55	61		
ELA Learning Gains				51					
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				17					
Math Achievement*	46	57	55	43	40	42	48		
Math Learning Gains				40					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42					
Science Achievement*	22	53	52	44	56	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		72	68		57	59			
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		53	51			
Graduation Rate		63	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		53	53		76	70			
ELP Progress		46	55		66	70			

* 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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	176
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	294
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	23	Yes	2	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	35	Yes	1	
HSP	55			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	41			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	49			

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%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	51			46			22					
SWD	20			23							3	
ELL	40			40							2	
AMI												
ASN	86			79							2	
BLK	40			30							2	
HSP	58			48							3	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48			45			20				4	
FRL	56			31			20				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	57	51	17	43	40	42	44					
SWD	38	47		21	27							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK												
HSP	58	55		35	43		53					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55	50	22	43	41	47	42					
FRL	46	38		34	29		38					

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	61			48								
SWD	54			31								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	69			47								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	55			47								
FRL	47			58								

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	53%	53%	0%	54%	-1%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	54%	-2%	58%	-6%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	45%	12%	47%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	37%	59%	-22%	54%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	62%	10%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	64%	-12%	61%	-9%
05	2023 - Spring	34%	61%	-27%	55%	-21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	23%	49%	-26%	51%	-28%

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 with our students with disabilities and free/reduced lunch students. Our students with disabilities was at 33%. Our next goal is to increase their proficiency by 10%.

In Reading, overall, the school was low in Poetry. The school curriculum has poetry units within each grade level, however, it is apparent that there needs to be a spiral review as well as an application in student reading and writing within this area.

In Math, the school was low in Geometric Reasoning, Measurement, and Data Analysis. This was a new area for our school and looking into contributing factors, for several years our students have struggled with fractions and the emphasis overshadowed Geometric Reasoning.

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

Our biggest decrease was in Math for FRL and Reading and Math for SWD. 5th grade Science is a concern, as well. The team associates the low performance to two factors; curriculum and facilitator.

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.

Our 5th grade Math had the greatest gap compared to the state average. This group of students came into 5th grade with a deficiency due to a loss of a certified Math teacher in their 4th grade year. This created a gap in several areas, causing the 5th grade Math teacher to remediate most of the year.

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

Math, overall, showed the most improvement from the previous year. We attest this to vetting a new curriculum in 21-22 and implementing it in 22-23. We had gains across the board to include 2 grade levels out performing the district and one grade level out performing the state.

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

Students scoring a Level 1 require intensive instruction in order to bridge the gap. A concern of the team is that some parents would rather opt out of intensive or tutoring opportunities and place more priority in after school sports or other activities.

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

1. Student with Disabilities
2. Economically disadvantaged students
3. Science
4. Middle School Math (to combat those previous years achievement gaps)
5. Poetry

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 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.

An area of focus for our school is the academic growth of our students with disabilities. The team concludes that teachers need more professional development related to instructing students with disabilities. Intervention and intensive instruction does not go away once a student has initiated an IEP, and often, teachers misunderstand this fact. Intervention and intensive instruction needs to remain and assessed frequently to ensure progress.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school intends to be intentional with the growth of our students with disabilities. Our goal is to improve from last years proficiency by an additional 10%.

Monitoring:

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

MTSS meetings will occur every 2 weeks to check on progress and discuss different interventions if progress is not occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Patterson (pattersond@manateeschools.net)

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.)

The school will use iReady (Curriculum Associates) progress monitoring to check on progress throughout the year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

iReady is a tool that we use in order to target the level of instruction for each student. It is a computer adaptive model that allows a teacher to assign specific lessons for a student. This intervention is key to targeting specific deficit areas for each child.

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.

Collaborating with the ESE Teachers

Teacher Training (Professional Development in Reading, Math, and MTSS)

Reviewing data and assigning MTSS data chat meetings

Working with the interventionist to ensure the proper interventions and small groups are beneficial to continuous progress.

Person Responsible: Dawn Patterson (pattersond@manateeschools.net)

By When: Training is during Pre-planning, in-service days and teacher planning periods throughout the school year. MTSS data meetings are each month, with Tier 3 happening bi-monthly,

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 Area of focus will definitely continue to be with SWD as their outcome proved to only equate to 33%. We are working with our ESE department to provide more interventions, scaffolding for the teachers, and small group work with activities to support the interventions. Additionally, our FRL's outcome was 37%. Another area of focus to create a positive culture and environment is to have meaningful parent involvement within the school. Another way is to celebrate achievements. Some students don't always find it as easy as their peers to make high grades, therefore, it is crucial that we celebrate the achievements they are making in other ways to keep their self esteem and motivation. For example, they could be a great athlete, artistic, or a great citizen.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will move our SWD and FRL by at least 10%. We are offering more training and professional development for classroom teachers, frequent MTSS meetings to look at the interventions and review the data to ensure they are making positive progress.

For our second area of focus, Teachers will include celebrations of students with disabilities by including categories mentioned above. This will be discussed in our bi-monthly MTSS meetings.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will check with teachers to ensure they are including students with disabilities during every data chat and offering additional interventions to help support the desired increase in proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Patterson (pattersond@manateeschools.net)

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.)

7 Habits of Happy Kids and quarterly celebrations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A simple acknowledgement for things that students with disabilities succeed in, reinforces resilience and self esteem.

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.

Collaborating with the ESE Teachers

Teacher Training (Professional Development in Reading, Math, and MTSS)

Reviewing data and assigning MTSS data chat meetings

Working with the interventionist to ensure the proper interventions and small groups are beneficial to continuous progress.

Person Responsible: Dawn Patterson (pattersond@manateeschools.net)

By When: Training is during Pre-planning, in-service days and teacher planning periods throughout the school year. MTSS data meetings are each month, with Tier 3 happening bi-monthly,

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Economically Disadvantaged**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.

Additional Targeted Support and Improvement was identified after seeing that our FRL students scored 37%.

We will be focusing more on real world application for this subgroup. The relevancy and the exposure to field experiences will offer aide to providing more background knowledge.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our FRL students will increase their proficiency by 7%, taking last years from 37% to this years up to 44%. Students are offered to attend additional and free tutoring after school in both Reading and Math from September through May.

Monitoring:

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

MTSS meetings will occur every 2 weeks to check on progress and discuss different interventions if progress is not occurring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Patterson (pattersond@manateeschools.net)

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.)

Provide instructional support in the area of emergent literacy skills (oral communication, knowledge of print and letters, phonemic and phonological awareness, and vocabulary and comprehension development). FCRR is a great resource for this.

Use concrete approaches (e.g., manipulatives) to build mental models of math concepts.

Emphasize academic language in content-specific instruction.

Utilize technology and other tools to promote math skills development and literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

FRL students need exposure to concrete approaches and experiences to offer more background knowledge as well as resources that they would not normally have access to outside of school.

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.

Collaborating with the ESE Teachers

Teacher Training (Professional Development in Reading, Math, and MTSS)

Reviewing data and assigning MTSS data chat meetings

Working with the interventionist to ensure the proper interventions and small groups are beneficial to continuous progress.

Person Responsible: Dawn Patterson (pattersond@manateeschools.net)

By When: Training is during Pre-planning, in-service days and teacher planning periods throughout the school year. MTSS data meetings are each month, with Tier 3 happening bi-monthly,

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).

Funding allocation and resources will be reviewed by the school leadership team and collaborating with the ESE team to include MTSS, Interventions in Reading and Math, Scaffolding within lessons, ESE small group support, extension activities, EL Curriculum Skills Block and ALL Block model that supports specific needs within the concept.

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

Offer instruction and practice in high-frequency words in the curriculum: Point to the word. Say the word. Then spell the word. Identify familiar letter sounds in the words. Use the high frequency words in an oral sentence and write the sentence, then underlining the high frequency word.

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

Last year:

58% of 3rd graders were proficient in ELA

52% of 4th graders were proficient in ELA

54% of 5th graders were proficient in ELA

56% of 6th graders were proficient in ELA

The area we saw the most needed improvement were Poetry and Comprehension with Information text.

Continue to teach asking and answering questions about key ideas and details.
When reading informational text, guide students to ask the following questions:
"Who or what is this book about?"
"Where does it take place?"
"When does it take place?"
"Why does this event happen?"
Emphasize using details from the text to answer these questions.

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

More than 50% of students in K-2 are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
We plan to increase our proficiency by 3% this year from last years outcome.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

More than 50% of students in 3-6 are on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
We plan to increase our proficiency by 3% this year from last years outcome listed below:
58% of 3rd graders were proficient in ELA
52% of 4th graders were proficient in ELA
54% of 5th graders were proficient in ELA
56% of 6th graders were proficient in ELA

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.

The schools MTSS team will be monitoring and meeting with teachers on a bi-monthly basis to ensure interventions and progress our on track.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Patterson, Dawn, pattersond@manateeschools.net

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?

The following practices meet Florida's evidence based and aligns with the Manatee K-12 CRP as well as the BEST ELA standards.

Differentiation

Evidence based interventions and Explicit Instruction

Strategies

Targeted intervention: Tier 1, 2

Intensive Intervention: Tier 3

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?

Differentiation: Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR)

Evidence-based intervention AND Explicit instruction: The teacher begins with a clear explanation of the targeted skill, followed by modeling of the skill. Ample practice opportunities, including guided practice with corrective feedback, supported application and student independent practice using aligned student materials help the student to apply what they have been taught.

Intensive intervention: Tier 3 intensive interventions as the most intense (increased time, narrowed focus, reduced group size) instruction and intervention based upon individual student need provided in addition to and aligned with core and supplemental academic and behavior curriculum and instruction. Multisensory instruction and intervention: multisensory instruction as involving the use of visual, auditory and kinesthetic-tactile pathways simultaneously or sequentially to enhance memory and learning of written language.

Sequential and systematic instruction: the importance for instruction being organized so that it follows a logical order and the sequence begins with the easiest and most basic concepts and progresses methodically to more difficult material. Each concept must also be based on those already learned. Concepts must be systematically reviewed to strengthen memory.

Strategy: instructional action that has definable elements of proficiency and an instructional purpose of appropriateness. A strategy can also be identified as a method, or activity that aids any student in the learning of a skill. Strategies are not tracked and do not provide information for progress monitoring of problem solving decision making.

Targeted intervention: Tier 2 targeted supplemental interventions as a more focused, targeted instruction/intervention in addition to and aligned with the core academic and behavior curriculum and instruction

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
Literacy Coaching - Instructional Staff will continue to receive literacy coaching from a highly effective teacher or administrator.	Patterson, Dawn, pattersond@manateeschools.net
Assessment - Progress Monitor, progress monitor, progress monitor! SWD, FRL, Tier 2 and Tier 3 will conduct regular progress monitoring assessments to ensure positive progress is occurring with the interventions planned by the MTSS team.	Patterson, Dawn, pattersond@manateeschools.net
Professional Learning - Instructional Teachers will attend regular professional learning to address and learn additional literacy strategies, mathematical problem solving strategies to use with students, and additional accommodations for SWD.	Patterson, Dawn, pattersond@manateeschools.net