

Manatee County Public Schools

# Manatee School For The Arts School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

## Manatee School For The Arts

700 HABEN BLVD, Palmetto, FL 34221

<https://www.msfta.org/>

### SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

#### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

#### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

#### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement.

The Mission of the Manatee School For the Arts (MSA) is to provide an educational environment that will allow the most students to succeed and grow academically by acknowledging and accommodating different learning styles and multiple intelligences. We believe that is best achieved by a curriculum that infuses and integrates the visual and performing arts into the core academic curriculum and offers a broad range of visual and performing arts as electives.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision for Manatee School For the Arts (MSA) is to accelerate and enrich our students to achieve a high level of success as they exhibit academic excellence through artistic expression. This integration of academics and the Arts students will provide all students to find their voice as they are challenged with a rigorous curriculum. Manatee School of the Arts core beliefs:

- We believe all students will benefit from an arts-infused curriculum that is integrative, creative, and exploratory.
- We are committed to using varied teaching and learning approaches to foster imagination, creativity, and to develop needed life-skills.
- We foster a positive school climate with educators committed to all students, families, community partnerships, and an adult advocate for every student.
- We challenge our students with an academic program rich with technological learning opportunities.
- We nurture the emotional, physical, and intellectual well-being of each student in preparation for a lifetime of learning.

### 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
		Mr. Steven Zickafoose, Sr. Director of School Improvement
		Dr. Steven Marshall, Principal
		Mr. Luis Caro, Assistant Principal
		Ms. Jane Simon, Assistant Principal

#### 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, including school leadership, teachers, and students were an essential part of the development of this improvement plan. Through small group meetings, surveys, and data-based planning the goal and strategies identified in this SIP were developed.

### 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))

Twice a quarter MSA will review student grades and relevant assessment scores to review the progress of our students to determine if progress is occurring. In the event that not enough progress is occurring to close the gap for our goals then school leadership will reconvene to identify additional strategies and implementation efforts to help secure success.

### Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	60%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	62%
<b>Charter School</b>	Yes
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

## 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	38	24	83	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	72	65	176	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4	31	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	82	94	71	247	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	84	94	168	346	
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		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	26	25	69	

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	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) 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	0	
One or more suspensions	0	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	0	
Course failure in Math	0	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	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	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	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*	51	44	50	55	48	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				50			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			50		
Math Achievement*	39	42	38	45	35	38	46		
Math Learning Gains				44			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			30		
Science Achievement*	52	64	64	57	45	40	42		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	59	66	78	43	48	68		
Middle School Acceleration	56			54	37	44	25		
Graduation Rate	95	84	89	91	63	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	61	61	65	57	66	67	39		
ELP Progress	41	41	45	56			57		

*\* 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	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	677
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	91

### 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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN	65			
BLK	54			
HSP	53			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	68			

**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
FRL	53			

**2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

<b>ESSA Subgroup</b>	<b>Federal Percent of Points Index</b>	<b>Subgroup Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%</b>	<b>Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%</b>
SWD	41			
ELL	38	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	63			
BLK	49			
HSP	51			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	52			

**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**

<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2021-22</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2021-22</b>	<b>ELP Progress</b>
All Students	51			39			52	77	56	95	61	41
SWD	24			13			27	48		20	7	33
ELL	27			27			21	66	60	9	8	41
AMI												
ASN	65			40			91				3	
BLK	43			33			30	61		65	6	
HSP	42			33			42	73	51	50	8	40
MUL	57			51			63	84	69	73	7	

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	61			45			66	82	56	68	7	
FRL	44			33			41	73	49	54	8	38

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	55	50	44	45	44	46	57	78	54	91	57	56
SWD	27	39	33	22	41	46	29	60		87	31	33
ELL	31	34	31	27	32	45	24	55	42			56
AMI												
ASN	50	47		78	50			91				
BLK	43	42	43	33	39	42	44	73	33	93	50	
HSP	49	48	39	38	38	44	44	74	49	89	42	56
MUL	58	57	64	49	47	50	68	86	67			
PAC												
WHT	64	53	49	55	50	51	73	81	60	92	63	
FRL	48	47	42	39	43	49	49	74	51	88	45	52

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	56	58	50	46	35	30	42	68	25	97	39	57
SWD	23	48	50	21	28	26	19	41		95	17	43
ELL	30	48	54	29	23	18	20	48	18	93	8	57
AMI												
ASN	61	71		55			50					
BLK	46	50	30	32	28	29	38	67	36	100	38	
HSP	49	55	51	40	31	27	36	60	20	97	31	55
MUL	72	55		52	38	40	53	74	45			
PAC												
WHT	63	62	57	53	41	35	46	74	24	97	43	
FRL	48	54	48	39	30	27	38	63	22	95	34	52

**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
10	2023 - Spring	57%	44%	13%	50%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	43%	43%	0%	47%	-4%
08	2023 - Spring	53%	45%	8%	47%	6%
09	2023 - Spring	57%	46%	11%	48%	9%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	45%	0%	47%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	54%	-14%
07	2023 - Spring	32%	58%	-26%	48%	-16%
08	2023 - Spring	28%	41%	-13%	55%	-27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	29%	45%	-16%	44%	-15%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	58%	-8%	50%	0%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	56%	-1%	48%	7%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	64%	9%	63%	10%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	69%	9%	66%	12%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	58%	17%	63%	12%

### III. Planning for Improvement

#### Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Our middle school math showed the greatest gap in performance compared to district and state scores of proficiency. Factors that contributed to this gap include the inception year of a new assessment reflecting the BEST Math Standards. Although some resources were available to the newly hired staff in those grade levels, more support was necessary to ensure the instruction reflected fidelity to the standards. Nationally, math scores did decline and MSA, along with them, struggled to achieve.

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

Once again, math was our lowest and our greatest decline. Factors that contributed to this gap include the inception year of a new assessment reflecting the BEST Math Standards. Although some resources were available to the newly hired staff in those grade levels, more support was necessary to ensure the instruction reflected fidelity to the standards. Nationally, math scores did decline and MSA, along with them, struggled to achieve.

**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.**

Eighth grade math showed the greatest gap compared to Manatee School For the Arts. We were more aligned with the performance of the district in this area, yet, it was critical we started the year with a game plan on how to mitigate these struggling numbers.

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

Middle school acceleration to include 8th Grade Algebra, 8th Grade Geometry and other middle school students who take a high school course with an EOC increased by 7 points inside the school grade bucket. This increase reflects ensuring the correct students are scheduled correctly and properly supported. We believe we will continue increased proficiency in this area.

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

In reflection of the EWS data, an area of concern is 8th grade math proficiency. This data shows a high number of students who failed 7th grade math and, in 8th grade, were not proficient in Pre-Algebra. We have take immediate steps to support student learning in these grades.

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

Our highest priority during this year based on our data is the Federal Index for our English Language Learners. Currently Manatee School For the Arts has a 38% in this are of evaluation. MSA intends to focus on this component of improvement as our highest priority during this school year.

**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 Other****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.

For over 25 years, Manatee School For the Arts has thrived in creating a school where students can feel safe and experience all the Arts can do for building self-esteem and identity. Probably no other curriculum fosters imagination and creativity and develops needed life skills better than an arts-based curriculum. All students will benefit from the infusion and integration of arts into the curriculum while some will see the arts as a career path. It is clear that Manatee School For the Arts is designed to serve both these purposes since its inception, 25 years ago.

John Hattie (2019) cites that having positive teacher-student relationships have a significant positive impact on student achievement with an effect size of .52. Teachers and staff are our first line of connection with our students as they guide them through their Academics or their Arts. Our Arts opportunities provide for students to connect with not only others in the room but with themselves as they develop their own skills. The Arts at MSA include Dance (Hip-Hop, Ballroom, Tap/Jazz, Ballet), Art (2D-3D, Drawing, Painting, Sculpting, Costume Design, Jewelry Making), Music (Band, Orchestra, Guitar, Choir, Keyboarding, Songwriting, Commercial Music), Digital Arts (Cartoon and Illustration, Video Game Design, Photography, Photoshop/Illustrator, 3D printing), and Theater (Acting, Improv, Musical Theater, Stage Makeup, Stage Craft). These opportunities along with our over 20 clubs provide opportunities at MSA that other schools can't provide.

As we begin the 2023-2024 school year a positive school culture will increase student achievement and help support student retention in our charter school. Our gaps and declines in the areas within our data can be served by supporting the health of our school culture.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, 70% of all students will respond favorably to a survey assessing the school culture as defined with the areas of course offerings, teacher support, and overall perception of their school experience.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring of this data will be supported by tracking the number of referrals which occur each month. These will be compared to last years number of incidences by month and type. Additionally, tracking of the number of students who are allowed to attend the quarterly recognition field days will occur to support the monitoring of this outcome.

**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.)

MSA's Positive Behavior Support system is evidence-based and has proven to be an effective way to engage students each quarter and provide a way for students to feel part of the school culture. This type of intervention has proven to lower referrals and allow for a more positive Teacher-Student relationship.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

A positive school community is a combination of strong Teacher-Student relationships, positive social skills, role models, and apparent expectations. Teachers and leadership work to develop and maintain a positive school culture. This provides for increased instructional time, reduced referrals, and students who feel connected to the school and meet their need for belonging.

#### **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.

Track referral and field day data.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** Quarterly (Luis Caro)

Create and implement school climate survey.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** April 2024 (Steve Zickafoose)

Provide resources and supportive professional develop on continued Teacher-Student relationships.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** Fall 2023 (Dr. Steven Marshall)

**#2. 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.

As we approach this year, our 261 English Language Learners must be further supported to ensure their achievement continues to progress. Our Federal Index of 38% urges MSA to ensure that these students also experience the positive culture we have developed and continue to grow.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, 41% of students identified as ELL by the Federal Index (LY, LF, and LA) will achieve proficiency in Reading or Math as indicated by the FAST PM 3 assessment data.

**Monitoring:**

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

Monitoring of this data point will occur during each of our interim assessments and reviewed by the instructional leadership team to ensure growth toward our target.

**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.)

ELL Students who need intensive reading support will be identified from their FAST proficiency level (Levels 1 and 2) assessment data. MSA utilizes various evidence based strategies to support proficiency. These include an Intensive Reading course taught by a certified Reading teacher who utilizes Reading Plus, Oral Reading Fluency checks, Benchmark Assessments, and Lexile level monitoring. Students whose proficiency trajectory is not aligned towards grade performance will be recommended for the MTSS process for deeper review.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

All strategies are peer-reviewed documentation to support English Language Learner The use of computer-assisted technology will help underclass students fill learning gaps in areas such as phonics, phonetics, spelling, and reading comprehension which are tested in FAST Reading. Direct instruction is powerful for ELLs because it gradually introduces/reintroduces content, reinforces that content, and continually assesses student progress so as to prevent them from falling further behind their peers. This occurs within remediation classes and supports which occurs in the mainstream classes as well.

**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.

Identify English Language Learners and gather entry data while monitoring additional progressive data points.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** October 2023 and continued through the year (Steve Zickafoose)

Provide professional develop and resources for math classes in the attainment of BEST Math Standards.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** August 2023 (Steve Zickafoose)

Ensure teachers of ELL students are utilizing the battery of instructional strategies which have been proven to support emergent bilinguals. This includes differentiation. This will be supported by 2-3 Professional Development sessions.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** November 2023 (Luis Caro)

Ensure ELL team provides liaison support by reaching out to parents and guardians for added support.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** October and throughout the year (Ms. Kibbe)

Provide additional tutoring and mentoring for those ELL students who fall within the bottom quartile of reading and math.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** October 2023 (Dr. Steven Marshall)

### 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 school leadership, teachers, and the Board to ensure resource allocations are based on student need during Summer leadership meetings. Interventions for our Areas of Focus include:

- Early Warning Sign interventions
- Differentiation with our English Language Learners
- Utilizing the MTSS process for those who are not progressing.