Manatee Charter School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Manatee Charter School

4550 30TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34203

https://www.manateecharter.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.

Manatee Charter School will provide an inspiring and motivating educational environment that delivers real, measurable results and prepares our students to be the next generation of leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing Leaders for Life!

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
Morris, Lane	Principal	Instructional Leader Operational Leader

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.

Manatee Charter conducted a 2022-2023 Spring Survey and a 2023-2024 Fall Survey to gain input from ALL stakeholders. We also created a 10 1/2 hour a day summer program for 6 weeks. During this summer program, we were able to offer multiple remediation/enrichment opportunities. We facilitate a monthly Parent University session to collect feedback from parents and business owners. Community leaders and business leaders will assist families with pertinent information pertaining to specific needs.

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))

Weekly Data Chats
NWEA - 3 times per year
FAST - 3 times per year
3 - Six week sessions of tutoring (Pre/Post Test)
Surveys
The SIP is a working document and is reviewed on a monthly basis.

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	82%
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* 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	23	31	13	12	20	19	26	25	23	192
One or more suspensions	3	3	4	5	8	10	5	3	6	47
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	23	29	29	13	15	117
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	17	17	13	4	9	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	41	45	49	28	24	187
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	8	15	15	11	12	17	78

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	5	0	0	2	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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*	32	48	53	36	50	55	39		
ELA Learning Gains				46			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			53		
Math Achievement*	48	57	55	34	40	42	43		
Math Learning Gains				43			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			57		
Science Achievement*	20	53	52	25	56	54	18		
Social Studies Achievement*	63	72	68	71	57	59	50		
Middle School Acceleration	86	70	70	51	53	51	73		
Graduation Rate		63	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		53	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	40	46	55	52	66	70	42		

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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
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	46

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	462
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	14	Yes	2	2
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	47			
MUL	31	Yes	1	1
PAC				
WHT	46			
FRL	44			

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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	45			

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	46			
FRL	44			

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	32			48			20	63	86			40
SWD	4			20			9				4	23
ELL	24			46			17	53	91		6	40
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			37			8	69			5	
HSP	31			52			21	61	83		7	42
MUL	23			38							2	
PAC												
WHT	37			51			27	70			4	
FRL	30			47			18	65	82		7	32

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	36	46	49	34	43	55	25	71	51			52
SWD	6	45	55	11	28	25	0					42
ELL	25	36	41	32	40	56	23	73	55			52
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	35	45	47	26	41	53	12					
HSP	31	44	53	36	44	50	24	61	51			56
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	53		34	46							
FRL	32	45	51	31	44	54	18	70	50			45

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	39	47	53	43	55	57	18	50	73			42
SWD	9	42	57	23	54	54	8					
ELL	35	49	55	43	59	61	12	40	64			42
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	39		39	43	46	5	25				
HSP	39	47	54	41	55	60	15	58	68			41
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	37	54		50	70		43					
FRL	38	47	50	42	58	59	16	47	73			40

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	16%	53%	-37%	54%	-38%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	43%	-5%	47%	-9%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	34%	45%	-11%	47%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	54%	-20%	58%	-24%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	45%	-7%	47%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	47%	-13%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	54%	22%
07	2023 - Spring	57%	58%	-1%	48%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	47%	62%	-15%	59%	-12%
04	2023 - Spring	43%	64%	-21%	61%	-18%
08	2023 - Spring	59%	41%	18%	55%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	9%	61%	-52%	55%	-46%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	28%	45%	-17%	44%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	9%	49%	-40%	51%	-42%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	58%	24%	50%	32%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	69%	-6%	66%	-3%

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.

3-8 ELA. Some contributing factors to last year's low performance was poor Tier I instruction and not responding to data to inform instruction.

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

5th Grade Math and Science. Daily subs lead instruction for the majority of the year.

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.

5th Grade ELA, MATH, and SCIENCE. Daily subs lead instruction for the majority of the year.

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

Algebra and Geometry. Increase minutes of instruction. Trained teachers on how to use the extra minutes of instruction. Teacher to Student relationships were strong. Great Tier I instruction.

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

Attendance and the number of students who scored level 1 in Math and ELA

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

Black Students
SWD
Bottom Quartile growth in MATH and ELA
Growth in MATH and ELA

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 Black/African-American

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.

Provide mentors for our black students who are struggling academically
Book study of the Pack by Harrison.

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

55% of will black students will earn a growth point in Math and ELA.

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

Data Chats
PLP Conferences
NWEA - 3 times per year
FAST - 3 times per year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.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.)

iReady for Reading and Math
Parent Information Session - Closing the GAP
Lexia
Tutoring Sessions based on PM1 and PM2 Reading and Math data

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The following researched based interventions have a high success rate with students of color.

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.

Black students who have earn 1 referral or more will be assigned a Check In - Check Out Mentor.

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: October 1st, 2023

Our most highest underserved black students will participate in a book study, "The Pack" and create student ambassadors.

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: December 1st, 2023

#2. 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.

Responsive classrooms w/ Morning Meeting everyday.
Check-In and Check-Out Cards w/ mentors
Open access to our Licensed MHT

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

55% of SWD will will earn a growth point in Math and ELA.

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

Data Chats
PLP Conferences
NWEA - 3 times per year
FAST - 3 times per year

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.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.)

Wilson Reads
EASY CBM
iReady
OG
Touch Math

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The following researched based interventions have a high success rate with SWD.

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.

All ESE teachers and SLP will receive training on Orton Gillingham.

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: May 2024

Weekly PLCs and Data Chats with ESE Teachers.

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: September 2023

https://www.floridacims.org

#3. 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.

Increase athletic programs, clubs, and tutoring/enrichment programs to increase enrollment. Implement PBIS schoolwide. Increase community events. Deliver a robust tutoring program to close learning gaps. Created a 3 Tiered approach to social and emotional health

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

Decrease absentees by 20%

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

Bi-Monthly Child Study Team Meetings
Enrollment Reports
Create a new RtI Attendance Process

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.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.)

Child Study Team
Attendance RtI
PBIS

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With an increase in clubs and sports and a heavy focus on social and emotional health, we anticipate a large decrease in absentees. We also are tackling attendance obstacles through city bus passes, carpooling, and increasing the amount of outside daycare centers delivering students to and from Manatee Charter.

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.

Create and Implement Attendance RtI with fidelity

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: August 2023

Increase sport and club opportunities

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: August 2023

Develop and implement PBIS with fiedlity

Person Responsible: Lane Morris (lanemorris@manateecharter.org)

By When: August 2023

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).

Weekly meetings with school-based HR Business Personnel.
Monthly meetings with Support Center Financial Advisor
Monthly meetings with Grant Specialist
MTSS process
Collaboration with stakeholders
DI Small Group Instruction
Data Analyzation of Assessments - Implementing the instructional plan with fidelity

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

Tier ! Instructional w/ state approved core resource
Targeted Instruction on phonics and phonemic awareness
Lexia
iReady
Guided Reading
Science of Reading Strategies

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

Tier ! Instructional w/ state approved core resource
Targeted Instruction on fluency and comprehension
Lexia
iReady
Guided Reading
Science of Reading Strategies

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

55% of ALL students will earn a growth point measured by the STAR assessment in ELA and Math.
ALL students will meet their Guide Reading Level by May 2024.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

55% of ALL students will earn a growth point measured by the FAST assessment in ELA and Math.
ALL students will meet their Guide Reading Level by May 2024.

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.

NWEA - 3 times per year
FAST - 3 times per year
GRLs - Monthly

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Morris, Lane, lanemorris@manateecharter.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?

Savaas and HMH core resources aligned to Florida BEST standards
iReady
Lexia
Orton Gillingham
Lindamood Bell
Wilson

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?

We participated in the Science of Reading Professional Development in Summer 2023. The Support Center (Corporate Office) evaluates each research-based practice/programs. The program and/or interventions show a proven record to our population.

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
Professional Learning - Weekly Data Chats + Schoolwide writing prompts + Guided Reading Levels + NWEA Data + FAST Data + EASY CBM Data - 10 staff members participated in the "PLC at Work" Solution Tree Conference. - Guided Reading Training - Orton Gillingham Training - Science of Reading Training	Morris, Lane, lanemorris@manateecharter.org
Literacy Coaching - All ELA Teachers will participate in 3 coaching cycles with a Literacy Coach/ Assistant Principal (ALL Coaches are reading certified or reading endorsed. - Literacy Coaches and leadership staff will participate in a book study, "Getting better Faster".	Morris, Lane, lanemorris@manateecharter.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.

Webpage
Monthly Newsletter to Parents
Weekly Newsletters to Staff
Monthly Parent University Session

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))

Parent Conferences - 3 times per year
Increase volunteer opportunities
Quarterly Night Events
Parent University Sessions
Progress Reports and Report Cards

FAST and NWEA Data
Parent Surveys - 2 times per year

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))

We reorganized the staff. All grade levels are departmentalized except for K and 1st. We have increased instructional minutes for MS math and ELA to 108 minutes everyday. We will offer our Summer Slide program again this year. We are offering tutoring for students 2nd - 8th that scored a level one in reading and/or math.

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