

Manatee County Public Schools

Manatee School Of Arts/ Sciences 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Manatee School Of Arts/Sciences

3700 32ND ST W, Bradenton, FL 34205

<http://msasgeckos.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.

We believe through the arts and sciences our school will create an atmosphere in which all students will be intrinsically motivated. Low child to teacher ratio, family contracts and community interaction facilitates the students’ ability to construct their own knowledge. We maintain high expectations for all students to grow academically, physically, emotionally, and socially in order to continue their growth as citizens and their love of Manatee County.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to provide a clear and shared focus on student education with students, families, staff and administration. MSAS will maintain an atmosphere of high expectations, so students will grow to be leaders academically, socially, and emotionally in their communities. Staff members will effectively collaborate in order to provide an environment of learning that will foster internal motivation on the part of the students in order to strive for success. School leadership will provide a workplace culture which fosters respect, collaboration, and professional development. MSAS will maintain an environment where staff and students feel safe and secure; an environment conducive to learning and family involvement to produce student academic and personal growth as citizens of Manatee County.

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
Striplin, Kimberly	Teacher, ESE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Write and develop IEP for students - Co-teach with teachers - Implement IEP's for students -Hold IEP meetings with parents, staff and other facilitators. - Provide counseling to students when needed - Help manage behaviors <p>Other Team members include: Clinton Jones (Principal) Linda Brand (Registrar) Tristyn Fugate (Lead Teacher) (Kim Stripling ESE/504/ESOL)</p>

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 use its Title I Parent and Family Engagement Policy (PFEP) to satisfy this question. After conducting our comprehensive needs assessment, our parent involvement must continue to improve. To accomplish this with will make additional expenditures for supplies (including finger foods, postage, printing, etc.) for various events such as; Annual Title I Parent Meeting (August); Parent Conferences (one per quarter); Parent Workshops (one per quarter – Reading, Math, Science, Art); Student Showcases (one per quarter); End of the Year Title I Parent Meeting (May); End of the Year Open House (May). Our Title I coordinator Theresa Nunes will be instrumental in the improvements success. During our Title I meetings, Stakholder feedback, suggestions and imput are taken, collated and used to develop action plans for use in the SIP.

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 School's Leadership team meets regularly (bi-weekly) to evaluate and discuss ongoing areas that are being monitored, including the SIP. Diagnostic data is reviewed as it is made available to identify developing patterns and make changes to the SIP as needed throughout the year. Teachers, stakeholders and staff are consulted throughout the process to identify areas of growth and areas of struggle during the process.

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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	47%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
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)	English Language Learners (ELL)* 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 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: 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	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	4	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	4	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	23	8	0	0	0	0	31

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	4	4	0	0	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	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	2	4	4	5	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	8

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	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	0	0	8

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	30	51	53	49	55	56	54		
ELA Learning Gains				60			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45					
Math Achievement*	33	62	59	33	50	50	33		
Math Learning Gains				53			46		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64					
Science Achievement*	44	51	54	48	65	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	45	59	59						

** 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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	180
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	36	Yes	1	

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	30	Yes	1	1

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				
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	41			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	41			

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	30			33			44					45
SWD	30			30							2	
ELL											1	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	33			33							3	45
MUL												

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	28			34			47				3	
FRL	22			36			41				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	49	60	45	33	53	64	48					
SWD												
ELL	60			20								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	55			27								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	46	57		41	50		67					
FRL	44	59		25	48		30					

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	54	56		33	46		29					
SWD	42			17								
ELL	53			12								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK				10								
HSP	53			29								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	49	36		36	67							
FRL	44	41		20	44							

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	43%	53%	-10%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	54%	-18%	58%	-22%
03	2023 - Spring	29%	47%	-18%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	43%	62%	-19%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	64%	-37%	61%	-34%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	61%	-25%	55%	-19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	39%	49%	-10%	51%	-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.

Math Achievement: Although having strong instruction in math, student scores do not reflect improvement. Contributing factors include Inadequate home support in supplementing math learning, parent confusion over math curriculum and teaching methods, and lack of basic math fundamentals. This trend has been noticed for the past few years.

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

ELA Achievement, though not the lowest, did show the most decline whereas all other areas showed growth. Similar to math, at-home support, overall reading ability and practice, and comprehension is lacking. Those students who have stronger at-home support tend to do better than those students who do not have access to additional support. At the basic level, these deficiencies are then compounded each year and the gap is not bridged.

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.

Math Achievement: Although having strong instruction in math, student scores do not reflect improvement. Contributing factors include Inadequate home support in supplementing math learning, parent confusion over math curriculum and teaching methods, and lack of basic math fundamentals. Those students who have stronger at-home support tend to do better than those students who do not have access to additional support.

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

Science: We established a dedicated STEM class for all grade levels in addition to the required Science allotted time. In a typical week, students are introduced to a Science concept in the classroom 30min Science time, and then dive deeper into the subject with hands-on examples and application in the STEM block. Science resources are made available to parents and the Science instructor communicated very frequently with parents to aid at home study or projects.

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

Attendance: Each year is a constant struggle to have parents get students to school. Transportation issues seem to be few and far between. The common reason given is "They didn't want to get up." We are constantly trying to educate parents on the importance of reliable, consistent, and on-time attendance, and remaining at school for the entire school-day.

Home Supports: With our Parent Liason and Home-School Liason we are trying to support our parents at home so that learning can be continued, remediated, and practiced at home reliably. Parent/Student engagement in learning activities at home needs to be supported for those large gaps to close. The combined efforts of school and home learning are needed to bridge the more significant gaps.

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

- Math Achieve.
- ELA Achieve.
- ELL Support.
- Attendance.
- Home Learning Support.
- Curriculum alignment and teacher support.

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.

ELL Subgroup @ 40%: Using FAST data and available ELL data, ELL Subgroup hs been identified for additional support.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Utilizing ELlevation and additional ELL supports available, MSAS looks to raise ELL performance to 50%. Using FAST data, teacher data, and available ELL resources we will monitor the progress. Additional support to our parents for continuing ELL learning at home will be available.

Monitoring:

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

WIDA testing, i-Ready Diagnostic data, Growth Checks, FAST PM 1-3, teacher data, and parent feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Project ELlevation resources utilized in classrooms and with additional support at home. Evidence-based progress monitoring via i-Ready. ELL support is provided by the push-in teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELlevation provides various resources and supports for teachers to use to support their ELLs. Combined with the push-in teacher and at-home supports, progress monitoring should identify if the interventions are having the desired impact.

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.

1. Train teachers on use of ELlevation - Kim Striplin & Clinton Jones
2. Implement the use of ELlevation in classrooms - Teachers and Monitoring by Striplin and Jones.
3. Begin Data Collection - Teachers and Monitoring by Striplin and Jones
4. Data Analysis 2 weeks after implementation, repeating bi-weekly. Data Team (Teachers, Striplin, Jones, Fugate, Brand)
5. Repeat Data Collection and Analysis - Striplin & Jones
6. Quarterly Review for changes, progress and re-evaluation (Data Team)

Person Responsible: Kimberly Striplin (kimberly.striplin@msas-fl.com)

By When: Implementation start Q2 of 23-24. Progress Monitoring and Data Analysis Bi-Weekly Quarterly review of procedures at the end of Q2-Q4.

#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.

ATSI identified.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Continue to support and foster a positive environment for students and families. Continue and improve parent and student feedback on survey data.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of survey data and parent feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Stakeholder meetings and survey data will be gathered and used to plan and implement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

One of our strong suits here at MSAS is our overall positive culture and supportive environment. We will continue to support of students and parents to foster a good school-home relationship and provide resources to our stakeholders.

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.

- 1.) Develop Title I meetings and Stakeholder events (Principal & Home/School Liason, Registrar)
- 2.) Establish a calendar of events (Jones & Nunes)
- 3.) Host events, and gather data from events. (Nunes)
- 4.) Review data and feedback for trends (Jones & Nunes)
- 5.) Identify areas of focus and create plan to address each. (Jones& Nunes)
- 6.) Implement plans based on priority and feedback. (Teachers, Monitored by Jones, Nunes, Fugate and Brand)
- 7.) Monitor and re-evaluate (Jones & Nunes)

Person Responsible: Kimberly Striplin (kimberly.striplin@msas-fl.com)

By When: Begins at the start of each year and continues throughout the school year.

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)).

Each year the school works with Title I to set forth a budget of planned expenditures and needs. The MSAS Leadership Team meets regularly to evaluate school needs based on a variety of factors including school needs identified in the SIP. Parent conferences are held to gather feedback and ideas for the allocation of funds as well.

Implement & Monitor Early Warning System Interventions

Provide differentiated, scaffolded, and specialized instruction to all students

Utilize Inclusive practices

Implement and Monitor MTSS A/B process

Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan Implementation and Interventions

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.

School Website

<https://sites.google.com/msasgeckos.com/home/links?authuser=0>

Stakeholder meetings twice per year.

ClassDojo dissemination

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))

The school uses its Title I Parent and Family Engagement Policy (PFEP) to satisfy this question. After conducting our comprehensive needs assessment, our parent involvement must continue to improve. To

accomplish this with will make additional expenditures for supplies (including finger foods, postage, printing, etc.) for various events such as; the Annual Title I Parent Meeting (August); Parent Conferences (one per quarter); Parent Workshops (one per quarter – Reading, Math, Science, Art); Student Showcases (one per quarter); End of the Year Title I Parent Meeting (May); End of the Year Open House (May). Our Title I coordinator Theresa Nunes will be instrumental in the improvement's success.

<https://sites.google.com/msasgeckos.com/home/links?authuser=0>

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)

The school creates a daily schedule that respects and protects instructional time and limits non-productive time to the minimum. Being a tiny school and campus, very little time is wasted in transition and our tightly knit staff has what few transitions that we do have, down to a very brisk pace. This allows us to save every minute available and conserve instructional time. Our school day begins promptly and we accrue over the minimum instructional minutes each day. Title I funds are used to support our students with the purchase of data-driven and proven programs to complement instruction.

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))

N/A