

Manatee County Public Schools

Just For Girls Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 13 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 25 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Just For Girls Elementary School

1011 21ST ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

<http://www.myjfg.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.

Our mission is to establish a framework that empowers girls to aspire to more successful lives, pursue quality education, attain meaningful and financially equitable employment, and become compassionate contributors to society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is a community where young girls grow up feeling safe, capable, and smart, having developed self-respect and self-confidence, ensuring the well-being of their bodies and fostering academic aspirations. Through empowering one girl at a time, we aim to break cycles of poverty and failure among girls and women, ultimately strengthening our families, neighborhoods, and communities.

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 |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Beatty, Crystal | Principal | Instructional Leadership Staffing Performance Management Contract Administration Compliance Discipline Curriculum Oversight Data Analysis Progress Monitoring Personnel Assignments Operations Professional Development Staff Meetings Crisis Management |
| Jackson, Susan | Administrative Support | Parent and Student Liaison Volunteer Coordinator Emergency Preparedness Health and Safety Incident Reporting Safety Inspections Purchasing and Payroll Field Trips |
| Pearce, Kristen | Reading Coach | Testing Coordinator MTSS Management |
| Thompson, Heidi | Teacher, ESE | ESE Specialist ELL Compliance Specialist |
| Robinson, Tiffney | Registrar | Maintain the Student Information System Student enrollment and records Scheduling Data management Compliance and reporting Records requests Parent, student, and staff communications |
| Lemley, Carlene | Other | Assessment and Evaluation Behavioral Intervention Data Collection and Analysis Training and Education Crisis Management Progress Monitoring Documentation and Reporting Community collaborator |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| | | Positive Behavior Support Student and staff advocate |
| Rakowski, Angela | Instructional Coach | Teacher lead Curriculum support |

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.

JFGE's School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process involves actively engaging various stakeholders to ensure that the plan is comprehensive and reflective of the needs of our school community.

The involvement of these stakeholders follows a structured process, which includes the following steps:

- 1) Formation of a School Leadership Team (SLT): Establishment of the School Leadership Team (SLT) which is comprised of key stakeholders, including school administrators, teachers, support staff, and community leaders. The SLT represent the diverse perspectives and interests of our school community.
- 2) Data Collection and Analysis: The SLT gathers relevant data, including academic performance data, school climate surveys, and input from various stakeholder groups. The data analysis identifies areas that require improvement and informs the development of goals and strategies.
- 3) Stakeholder Engagement: The SLT engages stakeholders in the SIP development process through a variety of means, including surveys, focus groups, and meetings. Specific efforts are made to ensure that all voices are heard.
- 4) Data Sharing and Feedback: The SLT shares the collected data with stakeholders, providing them with a clear understanding of the school's current strengths and weaknesses. Stakeholders are encouraged to provide feedback and insights based on the data presented.
- 5) Goal Setting: Collaboratively, the SLT and stakeholders set specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) goals for the school. Goals align with the identified areas for improvement and reflect the shared priorities of the school community.
- 6) Strategy Development: Based on the established goals, the SLT and stakeholders work together to develop strategies and action plans. The strategies outline the steps, resources, and timeline required to achieve the set goals.
- 7) Resource Allocation: The SLT ensures that the necessary resources, including personnel and materials, are allocated to support the implementation of the SIP.
- 8) Plan Review and Revision: The draft SIP is shared with stakeholders for review and feedback. The SLT considers the input received and makes necessary revisions to the plan.

9) Approval and Adoption: Once the SIP reflects the collective input and priorities of stakeholders, it is presented for approval. The school leadership, in conjunction with the SLT, formally adopt the SIP.

10) Implementation: The SLT oversees the implementation of the SIP, ensuring that strategies are executed as planned.

This collaborative and inclusive process ensures that the School Improvement Plan reflects the needs, priorities, and aspirations of the entire school community. It also promotes transparency, accountability, and a shared commitment to our school's improvement efforts.

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))

JFGE's process for monitoring and evaluating the SIP involves ongoing assessment, data analysis, feedback, and adjustments as necessary.

Here's how our school plans to regularly monitor the SIP:

1) Data Collection and Analysis: Ongoing collection of relevant data, including student performance data, attendance rates, discipline records, and other indicators. Analysis of the data to identify trends, patterns, and areas where progress is or isn't being made.

2) Progress Monitoring: Three benchmarks for progress monitoring to assess the implementation of strategies outlined in the SIP. The use of formative assessments, benchmarks (FAST), and other tools to measure progress toward SIP goals.

3) Data Review Meetings: Data review meetings involving the School Leadership Team (SLT), teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders after each benchmark will be held. The purpose of these meetings will be to review data, identify strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the SIP and its impact on student achievement.

4) Stakeholder Feedback: Continuously solicit feedback from stakeholders to gather input on the effectiveness of strategies and areas where adjustments may be needed.

5) Evaluation of Interventions: Assess the effectiveness of specific interventions or initiatives aimed at addressing the achievement gap. Determine if those interventions are producing the desired outcomes and if not, consider other alternative approaches.

6) Regular Reporting: Provide regular updates and reports to the school community, including progress toward SIP goals and data on student achievement. Share findings, successes, and areas for improvement transparently.

7) Evaluation Tools and Rubrics: Develop evaluation tools and rubrics aligned with SIP goals and state academic standards. Use these tools to assess the quality of instructional practices, interventions, and support services.

8) Achievement Gap Analysis: Conduct in-depth analysis of the achievement gap, focusing on specific student subgroups that may be falling behind. Identify root causes and barriers to success for these students.

9) Revision Process: Establish a clear process for revising the SIP based on data-driven insights and feedback.

Determine who is responsible for initiating and leading revisions.

10) Action Plan for Revisions: Create an action plan that outlines the steps for making necessary revisions to the SIP. Ensure that the revisions are aligned with the original goals and objectives.

11) Inclusivity: Involve the SLT and key stakeholders in the revision process to maintain a collaborative approach. Seek input and consensus on proposed changes and prioritize revisions that directly address the achievement gap and align with the BEST standards.

12) Resource Allocation: Allocate resources, including professional development, personnel, and materials, to support revised strategies and interventions.

13) Monitoring of Revised Plan: Implement the revised SIP and closely monitor the impact of changes on student achievement. Continue to collect data and assess progress regularly.

By consistently collecting and analyzing data, seeking stakeholder input, and making data-driven revisions, our school can ensure that the SIP remains a dynamic and effective tool for achieving its goals, including narrowing the achievement gap among students.

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) | Alternative Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 81% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| 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) | Black/African American Students (BLK)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)* |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| School Improvement Rating History | 2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: MAINTAINING |

| | |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | 2016-17: MAINTAINING |
| 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 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Course failure in Math | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 3 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 3 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | |
| | 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 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |

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 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |

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 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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 | |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | |

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 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

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* | 18 | 51 | 53 | 30 | 55 | 56 | 18 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55 | | | 33 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 5 | 62 | 59 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 18 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 21 | | | 27 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Science Achievement* | | 51 | 54 | 10 | 65 | 59 | 0 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 66 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 52 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 12 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 23 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 2 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

| | |
|------------------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 25 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 126 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| 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 | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 5 | Yes | 4 | 4 |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |

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 | 7 | Yes | 4 | 3 |

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 | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | Yes | 3 | 3 |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 26 | Yes | 3 | 2 |

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 | 18 | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 10 | | | 0 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 14 | | | 0 | | | | | | | 2 | |

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 | 30 | 55 | | 10 | 21 | | 10 | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 14 | 46 | | 0 | 33 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 31 | 58 | | 10 | 22 | | 10 | | | | | |

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 | 18 | 33 | | 18 | 27 | | 0 | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 13 | | | 17 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 18 | 33 | | 18 | 27 | | 0 | | | | | |

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% | * | 54% | * |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 0% | 54% | -54% | 58% | -58% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | * | 47% | * | 50% | * |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | * | 62% | * | 59% | * |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 0% | 64% | -64% | 61% | -61% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | * | 61% | * | 55% | * |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | * | 49% | * | 51% | * |

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 lowest performance in mathematics, including subgroups, in the previous year can be attributed to several contributing factors.

- 1) Curriculum and Instruction: The need for professional development in innovative math instruction
- 2) Support for Struggling Students: Not all students may have received the necessary support for math difficulties, leading to a widening achievement gap.
- 3) School Attendance: High rates of absenteeism can hinder students' ability to fully engage in learning, including math.

4) Family and Community Engagement: Limited engagement with families and the community in supporting math learning.

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

According to the iReady end-of-year diagnostic results, the data component that exhibited the most significant decrease from the 2021/2022 school year to the 2022/2023 school year was grade 1 Mathematics. This decline becomes apparent when analyzing the Annual Typical Growth, with average annual growth in grade 1 dropping from 177% to 35%. This decline in math performance from the prior year may be attributed to several possible factors, with one key factor being the change in student group demographics from year to 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.

According to the most recent Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) results, the data component that exhibited the most significant difference when comparing the school and state average scores was mathematics. Possible factors contributing to this gap include a shortage of professional development related to the new math curriculum and a low attendance rate.

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

Based on the recent Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) results, the data component that displayed the most significant improvement between PM1 and PM3 was grade 5 Mathematics. This improvement is evident when comparing the achievement distribution, as the student achievement level in grade 5 progressed from 100% inadequate to 43%. The enhancements may be attributed to students' continued participation in the program, the adoption of the EnVision Mathematics Program by Savvas, and teachers' enthusiasm for instructing these subjects.

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

According to the Early Warning Signs (EWS) data, more than half of our students demonstrate two or more Early Warning System indicators. Data from the 22-23 school year highlights that the categories of the number of students with substantial reading deficiencies and Level 1 on statewide Math assessment are the top two areas of concern.

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

- 1) Increasing daily attendance
- 2) Improving instructional practices relating to Mathematics
- 3) Improving instructional practices relating to Reading
- 4) Improving tenure at JFGE with customized approaches

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Just for Girls Elementary's population, which includes subgroups such as ELL, African American, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged Students, comprises girls in grades K through 5 who are at an elevated risk of academic setbacks. These risks stem from persistent poverty, limited school engagement, and frequent changes in school attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Data from FOCUS, our schools' student management system, showed that 35% of the 43 girls who attended Just For Girls Elementary last year were absent 10% or more days in the school year. By the end of the current school year, the percentage of girls attending Just for Girls Elementary who are absent for 10% or more of the school days will be reduced from 35% to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

This outcome sets a specific target (reducing absenteeism to 15%) and provides a clear measure (percentage of girls with high absenteeism) that can be tracked to assess progress in improving attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffney Robinson (robinson2@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.)

One evidence-based intervention practice for addressing absenteeism is the implementation of a "Check and Connect" program. Check and Connect is a structured mentoring and monitoring intervention that has been proven effective in reducing absenteeism and improving student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research has shown that Check and Connect, when implemented with fidelity, can lead to significant reductions in absenteeism and increased engagement, ultimately improving students' chances of success in 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.

- 1) With the help of attendance data, identify students who are chronically absent early.
- 2) Assign each identified student a mentor who builds a positive and supportive relationship with them.
- 3) The mentor will regularly check in with the student to monitor attendance and academic progress. This

involves reviewing attendance records, communicating with teachers, and discussing any barriers to attendance.

- 4) The mentor will work with the student to address the underlying causes of absenteeism. This might involve connecting the student and their family to resources like counseling, social services, or academic support.
- 5) Together with the student, the mentor sets attendance goals and monitors progress toward those goals.
- 6) The mentor will maintain regular communication with the student, their family, and school staff to ensure a coordinated effort to improve attendance.
- 7) As the student's attendance improves, the level of support and monitoring is gradually reduced.

Person Responsible: Carlene Lemley (lemleyc@manateeschools.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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 Math Proficiency for all students including subgroups such as ELL, African American, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Achieve a Florida Department of Education School Improvement Rating of "Maintaining" or "Commendable" by lowering the percentage of students in grades K-2 who score below the 40th Percentile on Star Math and by decreasing the percentage of students in grades 3-5 who score below a Level 3 on the FAST Math.

Monitoring:

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

Students in grades K-5 will participate in the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) for Math during Progress Monitor 1, Progress Monitor 2, and Progress Monitor 3. Additionally, throughout the school year, students will engage in daily support using SuccessMaker Math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heidi Thompson (thompson3h@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 evidence-based intervention being implemented for tiered intervention in math is a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with a specific focus on math. MTSS is an evidence-based approach designed to support students' academic and behavioral needs through a tiered system of interventions.

SuccessMaker Math supports students in making progress regardless of their initial skill level. It is recognized as a highly effective evidence-based intervention under ESSA, offering sequential math practice, concise tutorials, and prerequisite review.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting MTSS with a focus on math is grounded in its track record of success, its emphasis on early intervention, its individualized approach, and its commitment to data-driven decision making—all of which contribute to improved math outcomes for students

SuccessMaker adaptive nature makes it suitable for personalized instruction at various proficiency levels. Additionally, it holds CASE certification for special education.

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) Assessments will take place to identify students' specific math difficulties and needs.
- 2) Data will be collected and analyzed on student reading performances, from FAST and SuccessMaker.
- 3) Implement the tiered intervention model (e.g., MTSS) that includes three tiers of support: whole group (Tier 1), targeted (Tier 2), and intensive (Tier3.)
- 4) Provide ongoing PD for teachers to enhance their expertise in evidence-based math instruction.
- 5) Engage parents and families in supporting their child's math development through ongoing communications.
- 6) Monitor progress through the regular assessments and adjust interventions as needed based on progress monitoring results.
- 7) Collaborate with the Instructional Support Team (IST) to discuss student progress and intervention strategies.
- 8) Maintain detailed records of interventions and student progress to share with relevant stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Heidi Thompson (thompson3h@manateeschools.net)

By When: Within 30 days of entering the program.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Increase Reading Proficiency for all students including subgroups such as ELL, African American, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Achieve a Florida Department of Education School Improvement Rating of "Maintaining" or "Commendable" by lowering the percentage of students in grades K-2 who score below the 40th Percentile on Early Literacy or Star and by decreasing the percentage of students in grades 3-5 who score below a Level 3 on the FAST ELA.

Monitoring:

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

Students will take the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) in Reading during Progress Monitor 1, Progress Monitor 2, and Progress Monitor 3. Additionally, throughout the school year, as mentioned in the district "Decision Tree", students will engage in weekly support using Star CBM and DIBELS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristen Pearce (pearcek@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 evidence-based intervention being implemented for tiered intervention in reading is a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework with a specific focus on reading. MTSS is an evidence-based approach designed to support students' academic and behavioral needs through a tiered system of interventions.

Star Assessments are evidence-based and proven to deliver dependable and valid data and are firmly grounded in research. They furnish educators with precise and dependable information regarding their students' accomplishments and progress.

DIBELS is a research-backed assessment tool that enables us to precisely evaluate the essential skills required for literacy development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting MTSS with a focus on reading is grounded in its track record of success, its emphasis on early intervention, its individualized approach, and its commitment to data-driven decision making—all of which contribute to improved reading outcomes for students

Star Assessments are highly praised by the National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII), trusted by more than 34,000 educational institutions and districts throughout the United States and demonstrated ability to predict both current and future performance on state assessments.

These skills associated with DIBELS are rooted in the Science of Reading, a body of research spanning over 40 years, which delves into the mechanisms of learning and the foundational skills and conceptual knowledge necessary for proficient reading.

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) Assessments will take place to identify students' specific reading difficulties and needs.
- 2) Data will be collected and analyzed on student reading performances, from FAST, DIBELS, and Star CBM.
- 3) Implement the tiered intervention model (e.g., MTSS) that includes three tiers of support: whole group (Tier 1), targeted (Tier 2), and intensive (Tier3.)
- 4) Provide ongoing PD for teachers to enhance their expertise in evidence-based reading instruction.
- 5) Engage parents and families in supporting their child's reading development through ongoing communications.
- 6) Monitor progress through the regular assessments and adjust interventions as needed based on progress monitoring results.
- 7) Collaborate with the Instructional Support Team (IST) to discuss student progress and intervention strategies.
- 8) Maintain detailed records of interventions and student progress to share with relevant stakeholders.

Person Responsible: Kristen Pearce (pearcek@manateeschools.net)

By When: Within 30 days of entering the program.

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).

The following process outlines how JFGE will effectively manage and allocate resources:

- 1) Data Analysis and Needs Assessment: Conduct a comprehensive data analysis to identify the specific needs of the school. This includes academic performance data, demographic information, and data related to the identified area(s) of focus within the SIP.
- 2) Prioritize Needs: Prioritize the identified needs based on their impact on student achievement and the achievement gap.
- 3) Resource Inventory: Identify available resources, both financial and non-financial, that the school can allocate toward improvement efforts.
- 4) Funding Sources: Find funding sources available to the school for improvement efforts. This may include federal, state, district, and grant funding. Clarify the requirements and restrictions associated with each funding source.
- 5) Collaborative Decision-Making: Establish a collaborative decision-making process that involves the School

Leadership Team (SLT), teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders.

6) Resource Allocation Committee: Form a Resource Allocation Committee responsible for reviewing funding options, budget proposals, and resource allocation recommendations.

7) Alignment with SIP Goals: Ensure that resource allocation decisions align closely with the goals and strategies outlined in the SIP. Prioritize funding for interventions and activities that directly address the identified needs and area(s) of focus.

8) Budget Planning: Develop a budget plan that outlines how resources will be allocated to specific interventions and activities. Allocate funding for professional development, materials, personnel, and other necessary resources.

9) Review and Adjustments: Periodically review the resource allocation plan to assess its effectiveness in meeting the school's needs and goals.

10) Monitor Expenditures: Monitor and track resource expenditures to ensure that funds are used as intended.

11) Regular Reporting: Report to stakeholders on the allocation and use of resources, including progress toward achieving SIP goals. Provide regular updates to keep the school community informed.

12) Evaluation of Impact: Continuously assess the impact of resource allocation on student achievement, particularly for students with the greatest achievement gap. Use data to determine whether adjustments are needed.

13) Grant Compliance: Ensure strict compliance with grant requirements and reporting obligations.

14) Documentation: Maintain detailed records of resource allocation decisions, budgets, and expenditures for transparency and accountability.

By following this process, JFGE can ensure that resources are allocated effectively to support the implementation of interventions and activities that address their specific needs and priorities, ultimately leading to improved student achievement and success.

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

As indicated by Star Early Literacy and Star Reading assessments in the preceding year, 100% of students in grades K-2 scored below the 40th percentile, demonstrating that they are falling behind in their progress toward passing the statewide ELA assessment.

Having full access to Benchmark Advance, students in grades K-2 will be given clear and specific guidance on the BEST standards encompassing reading writing, and vocabulary in all subject areas, aligning with grade-level outcome expectations. Further, students will have access to focused small-group instruction and tiered support interventions based on formative assessments, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

As indicated by the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) in the preceding year, 80% of students in grades 3-5 scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide ELA assessment.

Having full access to Benchmark Advance, students in grades 3-5 will be instructed in accordance with the BEST standards for literacy encompassing reading, writing, and vocabulary, aligning with grade-level outcome benchmarks. Targeted small-group instruction and tiered support interventions will be made available based on benchmarks, progress monitoring data, and diagnostic assessment data.

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

Our goal for this academic year is to have 50% or more of students in grades K-2, including subgroups, score above the 40th percentile to demonstrate readiness, as determined by the progress monitoring system, to achieve success in the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our goal for this academic year is to have 50% or more of the students in grades 3-5, including subgroups, demonstrate that they are on track to test proficient on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST).

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.

Grade-level teams will convene on a weekly basis alongside the Instructional Support Team (IST) to analyze data and craft instructional plans based on the data. This collaborative effort will be guided by

the Reading Coach and supported by the administration. For students encountering persistent reading challenges, close monitoring will be implemented to ensure they receive the necessary support and personalized differentiation during small group sessions and interventions. Conversely, students displaying improved reading proficiency will be integrated into enrichment programs to safeguard and further develop their proficiency levels.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Beatty, Crystal, beattyc@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?

With our adoption of Benchmark Advanced in the previous year, which aligns with the B.E.S.T. ELA standards, our current emphasis is on ensuring we have additional evidence-based programs. These programs aim to build foundational reading skills such as phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency, all with the intent of enhancing reading proficiency. We will incorporate the utilization of the Next Step Guided Reading Assessment Kit for running records (Tier 1), Benchmark Advance Differentiated (Tier 2) Lessons, and the Benchmark Advance Phonics Intervention Toolkit (Tier 3). To guarantee differentiation in instructional approaches, we will maintain a continuous process of progress monitoring and responsive instructional planning.

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?

The evidence-based practices of tier intervention and programs (Next Step Guided Reading Assessment Kit, Benchmark Advance Differentiated Lessons, and Benchmark Advance Phonics Intervention) address the identified need. These programs have been carefully selected by the district and shared with schools through the Decision Tree based on research and data, indicating their success in addressing the specific needs of the students they are designed to support. Their effectiveness is supported by empirical evidence and research studies, ensuring that they are well-suited to meet the educational goals and requirements of the target 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 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Literacy Leadership: The Instructional Support Team (IST) consists of the Reading Coach, the ESE/ESOL Specialist, the Lead Teacher/Instructional Coach and Administration. This team will provide leadership and direction for literacy efforts, ensuring alignment with school goals and instructional practices. Hold regular meetings for the IST to review student performance data, identify trends, and make data-driven decisions. These meetings will help pinpoint areas of improvement, allowing for targeted interventions and instructional adjustments.</p> | |
| <p>Literacy Coaching/Professional Development: Implement a system where literacy coaches work closely with teachers on a regular basis to model effective strategies, co-plan lessons, and provide feedback. Ongoing coaching will support teachers in implementing best practices in literacy instruction and address individual classroom needs. Seek Professional Development opportunities through the district led by literacy coaches on various topics, such as differentiated instruction, phonics strategies, and literacy assessment. These PD's will empower teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to enhance their literacy instruction.</p> | |
| <p>Assessment/Data Analysis: Train teachers on effective formative assessment techniques, including running records, comprehension checks, and phonics assessments. Improved formative assessments will help teachers monitor student progress more effectively and tailor instruction accordingly. Once every month, meet with teachers to collaboratively analyze assessment data, identify struggling students, and create individualized intervention plans. Collaborative data analysis will enable teachers to respond promptly to students' needs and improve literacy outcomes.</p> | <p>Rakowski, Angela, rakowskia@manateeschools.net</p> |
| <p>Professional Learning/Peer Observations: Collaboratively develop personalized professional learning plans for teachers based on their individual strengths and areas for growth in literacy instruction. Tailored professional development will address specific teacher needs and promote continuous improvement in literacy teaching.</p> <p>Foster a culture of peer observations and learning communities, where teachers can observe and learn from each other's successful literacy practices. Peer collaboration and observations provide opportunities for teachers to share effective strategies and promote a culture of continuous improvement.</p> | |