Manatee County Public Schools

Imagine Charter School At North Manatee School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Imagine Charter School At North Manatee

9275 49TH AVE E, Palmetto, FL 34221

http://www.imagineschoolsnorthmanatee.com/home/

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.

Imagine North Manatee's mission is to develop all scholars' self-determination, cultivate character, and bridge opportunity gaps.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every Imagine North Manatee student will achieve above-average learning gains within one year. Every student ISNM serves will reach or exceed proficiency within three or fewer years.

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
Kelly, Erin	Principal	Implement the school's charter in collaboration with the school's board of directors and the authorizing institution. Establish and communicate standards for student and professional performance. Continually assess school practices and procedures and adjust them to support the diverse learning needs of students. Assume responsibility for the health, safety and welfare of the students, staff and visitors. Infuse the school culture with Imagine Schools Non-Profit's Six Measures of Excellence. Demonstrate an understanding of the Imagine Schools Non-Profit Six Measures of Excellence in the execution of duties. Model positive character virtues and habits. Assist students in developing positive moral and performance character attributes. Responsible for overseeing the financial management of the school, including: development of the annual budget, overseeing the management of accounts payable and accounts receivable, approving payroll, and provision of required financial reports to the board, district and state. Also responsible for seeing that the annual financial audit is completed in a timely manner. Responsible for the hiring and supervision of school personnel. Collaborate and clearly communicate with parents/guardians, and other educators to assist the students. Regularly communicate with all members of the school community.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders are involved and their input is used in the SIP development process through staff, parent, and student surveys. Stakeholders also attend annual Open House, monthly Parent Action Committee

meetings, bimonthly Six Measures Commitee meetings, and quarterly governing board meetings in order to give input on and be involved in the SIP process.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) uses multiple data sources, including FAST, STAR, iReady/Lexia, attendance, and discipline referrals, to establish SIP goals and action plans, to monitor progress, and to modify intervention plans, when necessary.

ILT members will use progress monitoring data to track subgroup growth and aim to see the percentage of students who demonstrate learning gains on FAST, STAR, and i-Ready/Lexia progress monitoring assessments increase by at least 10% per assessment window.

Instructional leaders and teachers will engage in tracking the percentage of their overall, bottom quartile, SWD, ELL, Black/African American, Multiracial, and high risk (two or more EWS indicator) students who demonstrate a learning gain and will modify intervention plans in cases subgroup growth does not meet targeted levels.

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 PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
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) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: 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	8	15	20	23	20	8	15	20	22	151
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	2	9	7	13	20	53
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	27	14	19	26	18	110
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	16	15	19	11	8	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	31	47	46	77	42	43	25	25	25	361

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	3	10	9	9	10	20	27	92

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more school days	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*	43	48	53	47	50	55	55		
ELA Learning Gains				49			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				30			62		
Math Achievement*	55	57	55	48	40	42	53		
Math Learning Gains				53			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			46		
Science Achievement*	39	53	52	47	56	54	35		
Social Studies Achievement*	67	72	68	55	57	59	68		
Middle School Acceleration	100	70	70	74	53	51	75		
Graduation Rate		63	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		53	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	68	46	55	33	66	70	51		

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	482
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	24	Yes	4	2
ELL	29	Yes	4	2
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	44			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	62			

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	55			

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	28	Yes	3	1
ELL	29	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	43			
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	42			

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	43			55			39	67	100			68
SWD	18			37			17	40			5	
ELL	15			31			0				5	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			50			31				4	
HSP	35			52			34	57			6	64
MUL	43			57							2	

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	49			60			49	77	100		6	
FRL	39			51			35	63	100		7	61

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	47	49	30	48	53	46	47	55	74			33
SWD	24	29	15	24	53	48	0					
ELL	21	30	19	35	44	33	28	17				33
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	34	10	42	39	36	43	55				
HSP	39	44	31	42	56	41	32	40	69			32
MUL	40			40								
PAC												
WHT	56	55	38	55	53	52	61	78	75			
FRL	38	44	29	37	52	46	31	38	61			44

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	55	65	62	53	57	46	35	68	75			51
SWD	25	38	35	27	42	37	19	45				
ELL	25	44	57	32	50	47	15	20				51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39	56	64	32	41	33	20					
HSP	49	68	72	44	59	52	26	54	71			50
MUL	44	55		56	55							
PAC												
WHT	62	66	40	62	60	38	45	74				
FRL	48	66	70	47	60	53	32	59	86			55

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	53%	-6%	54%	-7%
07	2023 - Spring	49%	43%	6%	47%	2%
08	2023 - Spring	36%	45%	-9%	47%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	54%	3%	58%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	47%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	36%	47%	-11%	50%	-14%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	59%	-6%	54%	-1%
07	2023 - Spring	61%	58%	3%	48%	13%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	59%	3%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	64%	-6%	61%	-3%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	41%	13%	55%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	61%	-20%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	32%	45%	-13%	44%	-12%
05	2023 - Spring	42%	49%	-7%	51%	-9%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	58%	42%	50%	50%

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	66%	69%	-3%	66%	0%

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.

Using 2023 proficiency data, ISNM's subgroup with the lowest performance was SWD, with 28% proficiency (6% lower than the 34% proficiency in 2021).

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

When considering 2022 learning gain data, ISNM's lowest performing data component was ELA bottom quartile learning gains, with 14% drop (from 44% in 2019 to 30% in 2022).

Using 2023 proficiency data, both ISNM's SWD and ELL subgroups had a 1% decline in ELA proficiency, with SWD proficiency falling from 29% in 2022 to 28% in 2023 and ELL proficiency dropping from 30% in 2022 to 29% in 2023.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The ELA learning gains of ISNM's lowest 25% scholars had the greatest gap, in comparison with the state average. In 2022, three was a 16% gap in the percentage of bottom quartile students who demonstrated a learning gain in ELA (46% state average compared to 30% at ISNM).

Teacher changes in grades 6-8 were the greatest contributing factor to this gap. Both of ISNM's middle school ELA educators spent a portion of the year on maternity leave, with one of the teachers on an extended leave than spanned four months. Both teachers taught Intensive Reading and their leaves also contributed to SWD, ELL, and Black subgroup proficiency drops from 2021 to 2022.

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

ISNM's Black subgroup demonstrated a 7% increase in ELA proficiency, moving from 30% in 2022 to 37% in 2023. ISNM expanded student access to literacy interventions by adding literacy courses in

grades 6-8 and a 30 minute literacy intervention block in grades K-5. The additional courses and literacy blocks had the biggest impact on scholars needing intervention in vocabulary development and comprehension rather than on scholars needing foundational skill intervention.

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

The high number of ISNM scholars with a substantial reading deficiency is the school's largest area of concern.

A secondary concern, but more challenging to impact, is the high number of ISNM scholars who were absent for 10% or more of the school year. As a charter school, ISNM does not have access to the high stakes impact of the school district's Truancy Court intervention. Interventions implemented by ISNM's social worker and leadership team have not made a noticeable impact on the parents of truant students.

There is a direct correlation between students with a substantial reading deficiency and a pattern of truancy. More than 75% of ISNM scholars with a pattern of truancy have a substantial reading deficiency; therefore, ISNM's social worker will continue leading implementation and monitoring of attendance interventions, in support of literacy development.

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

1 Aligned and differentiated, on grade-level instruction - Teachers will use Florida B.E.S.T. Standards (K-8) to plan and instruct the daily English Language Arts, following the Science of Reading Structured Literacy approach (phonological awareness, explicit and systematic phonics instruction starting with sound-symbol relationships), and syllabication. The literacy block's instructional framework includes explicit and systemic foundational skills instruction, an interactive read aloud, a mini lesson, shared reading, guided reading and independent reading, and close reading of complex text with a science, social studies, or math connection.
2 Aligned and differentiated instruction, delivered at students' instructional level – In grades K-5, all students will receive 30 minutes of differentiated literacy interventions (school-wide intervention time), in addition to the uninterrupted core reading block. In grades 6-8, all students who scored below level on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment will receive a 55-minute Foundational Reading course, in addition to their Language Arts class. All students who scored a Level 1 on the 2023 FAST ELA assessment will attend a 45-minute Intensive Reading course, in addition to their Foundational Reading and Language Arts classes. All SWD, ELL, Black/African American, and Multiracial scholars will be invited to participate in Extended Learning Opportunities, beginning during the Spring 2024 semester. Participating students will receive one to four hours per week of differentiated literacy instruction.
3 Delivery of targeted, research-based reading interventions – All students with reading deficiencies will receive daily interventions using Wilson Fundations (K-2), Heggerty (K-1); Phonics for Reading (2-3); Rewards Intermediate (4-5); and Rewards Secondary (6-8); Lexia (K-8); and/or targeted small group interventions (K-8) with fidelity. Teachers will utilize assessment data to develop fluid student groups and provide appropriate, intensive interventions in the components of reading (Oral Language, Print Concepts, Phonics, Phonemic Awareness, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension). ESSER Funds are being used to increase SWD and ELL students' access to highly-qualified educators and paraprofessionals trained to provide interventions to corresponding subgroups.
4 Unwrapping the standards to plan and instruct, using authentic literature and engagement strategies – Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) twice a week to deepening their understanding of unwrapping the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards and backwards planning of aligned activities and assessments.
5 Students will use Lexia Core 5 (K-5) and Lexia Power Up (6-8) to complete 45 minutes of weekly adaptive, software-based literacy interventions.

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 Teacher Attendance

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.

ISNM's Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will strengthen the campus' positive culture and environment by equipping educators with supportive, job-embedded professional development, such as PLCs and instructional coaching support, and access to engaging, efficient, and effective resources to support planning and instruction.

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

If Tier I instruction is aligned to the rigor of the benchmarks, scaffolded to address individualized students' needs, and designed to increase accountability for learning among all students, then ELA and Math proficiency will increase by 10% or more as measured by 2024 Spring FAST. This expected growth is applied to all students at each grade level and for each ESSA subgroup to meet or exceed 41% proficient. The aim is to effectively scaffold students' mastery of benchmarks while closing achievement gaps for non-proficient students.

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Kelly (kelly2e@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.)

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

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. Facilitated, collaborative planning to increase teacher expertise of what students must know, understand, and be able to do aligned to the rigor required of the benchmarks and to plan instructional task that engage all students. Weekly collaborative planning will also address remedial and accelerated instruction for small groups and provide opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

2. Define Look Fors related to high-quality instruction that are present every day, in every classroom, and for the benefit of every student. Create and use systems for monitoring Look Fors to strengthen alignment of daily instructional tasks to grade level benchmarks, ensure fidelity use of instructional resources for remedial and intervention instruction, and utilize strategies to engage all students.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 2023

3. Identify the instructional practice(s) that will increase teacher capacity and create a plan for coaching to accelerate improvement. Create systems for monitoring the focus, frequency, and types of coaching and support for improved teaching and learning.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023

4. Create a calendar of yearlong meeting structures (ILT, TCT, PLC, and IST) to analyze student performance data, define key attributes of learners to address their unique needs, and evaluate available resources best matched to students' needs.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023

5. Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 25, 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.

ELA proficiency of ISNM's SWD fell below 41%. The 2023 ELA proficiency of ISNM's SWDs was 28%, which fell from 29% in 2022, 34% in 2021, and 32% in 2019).

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 38% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will score proficient or higher in English Language Arts (from 28% in 2023, 29% in 2022, 34% in 2021, and 32% in 2019).

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Kelly (kelly2e@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.)

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

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.

Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 25, 2023

#3. 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.

ELA proficiency of ISNM's Black/African American scholars fell below 41%. The 2023 ELA proficiency of ISNM's Black/African American subgroup was 37% (a 7% increase from 30% in 2022).

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 47% of Black/African American scholars will score proficient or higher in English Language Arts (from 37% in 2023, 30% in 2022, and 41% in 2021).

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Kelly (kelly2e@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.)

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

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.

Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 25, 2023

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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

ELA proficiency of ISNM's ELL scholars fell below 41%. The 2023 ELA proficiency of ISNM's ELLs was 29%, which fell from 30% in 2022, 38% in 2021, and 36% in 2019).

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 39% of English Language Learners (ELLs) will score proficient or higher in English Language Arts (from 29% in 2023, 30% in 2022, 38% in 2021, and 36% in 2019).

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Erin Kelly (kelly2e@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.)

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

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.

Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 25, 2023

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

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.

ELA proficiency of ISNM's Multiracial fell below 41%. The 2023 ELA proficiency of ISNM's Multicultural students was 40% in 2023.

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

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, 50% of Multicultural students will score proficient or higher in English Language Arts (from 40% in 2023).

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

Systems for monitoring high-quality instruction include (1) Facilitated, collaborative planning; (2) Regular classroom observations with feedback and coaching; (3) Routine use of student performance data to make instructional decisions; (4) Multi-Tiered System of Support; and (5) regular team meetings, such as ILT, PLCs, and TCTs, to monitor progress toward school improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support

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

An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

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.

Implement a response to intervention framework (MTSS) to support students' academic and behavioral success.

Person Responsible: Erin Kelly (kelly2e@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 25, 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).

Collaborate with stakeholders during annual Open House, monthly Parent Action Committee meetings, bimonthly Six Measures Commitee meetings, and quarterly governing board meetings. During these meetings, stakeholders review school funding allocations to ensure resources are allocated based on needs and support ISNM's diverse range of needs, as supported by data.

Interventions and activities included in the SIP include:
Early Warning System interventions
Differentiated, scaffolded, and specialized instruction
Inclusion practices
MTSS Process
Comprehensive evidence-based literacy interventions