

Manatee County Public Schools

Imagine Charter At Lakewood Ranch School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Imagine Charter At Lakewood Ranch

10535 PORTAL CROSSING, Bradenton, FL 34211

<http://imagineschoolslakewoodranch.org/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.

At Imagine Lakewood Ranch, teachers, parents, students, community members, and school leaders are committed to providing a unique educational experience for children that is innovative, exciting, and, most importantly, fun. The enthusiastic, energetic, and dedicated personnel of Imagine Lakewood Ranch will create an environment of academic excellence while fostering both leadership and character within our students. Imagine Lakewood Ranch shall be a learning community filled with achievement and hope where every child is given an opportunity to succeed.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Imagine Lakewood Ranch is an innovative learning community where every child is inspired to succeed.

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
Allen, Ashley	Principal	<p>Implement the school's charter in collaboration with the school's board of directors and the authorizing institution.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Assume responsibility for the health, safety and welfare of the students, staff and visitors.</p> <p>Infuse the school culture with Imagine Schools Non-Profit's Measures of Excellence.</p> <p>Demonstrate an understanding of the Imagine Schools Non-Profit Measures of Excellence in the execution of duties.</p> <p>Model positive character virtues and habits. Assist students in developing positive moral and performance character attributes.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Responsible for the hiring and supervision of school personnel.</p> <p>Collaborate and clearly communicate with parents/guardians, and other educators to assist the students.</p> <p>Regularly communicate with all members of the school community.</p> <p>Support the MTSS Process and Data Collecting.</p> <p>Teacher and Staff Florida Consortium Evaluations.</p> <p>Responsible for overseeing Charter Renewal and Accreditation.</p>
		<p>Instructional Coach: Caitlin Johnson</p> <p>Monitors curricular focuses; host data chats and collaborative planning. Assists in disaggregating data and creating goals with action steps. Hosts instructional coaching cycles.</p>
		<p>Character Dean: Katie Williams</p> <p>Creates and supports the school-wide behavior plan and character focuses. co-monitors parent communication; assigns disciplinary action and monitors student improvement; creates behavior goals.</p>
		<p>MTSS Coordinator: Dianne Fisher</p> <p>Monitors tier 2 and 3 academic, attendance, and behavior data and plans for improvement; facilitates biweekly grade level meetings.</p>

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

Data was collected from 2023 State reporting, charter organization surveys, and instructional evaluations. The principal, instructional coach, and dean met to disaggregate data, review the previous year, and determine appropriate goals. The group then met with teacher leaders to provide overview and gather feedback before the plan's finalizations of goals and action steps. Student and family feedback was gained through survey data.

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))

Imagine Schools requires an annual School Excellence Plan that receives evaluative review three times per year. In addition, the SEP/SIP will be updated and revised as progress monitoring data is received from F.A.S.T. and Star assessments.

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	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	53%
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: B 2018-19: B 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	10	8	13	15	11	8	5	5	3	78	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	5	13	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	7	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	14	9	8	9	56	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	9	10	10	13	54	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	11	

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	0	0	0	

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	9	20	16	17	17	11	10	8	9	117
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	4	3	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	0	11
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	12	14	9	8	9	56
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	9	9	10	10	13	54
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	7	2	0	1	0	0	0	11

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	1	5	9	7	7	5	6	40

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	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	45	48	53	48	50	55	46		
ELA Learning Gains				57			43		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			50		
Math Achievement*	46	57	55	46	40	42	39		
Math Learning Gains				52			38		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			33		
Science Achievement*	42	53	52	39	56	54	31		
Social Studies Achievement*	83	72	68	77	57	59	68		
Middle School Acceleration	75	70	70	52	53	51	70		
Graduation Rate		63	74		52	50			
College and Career Acceleration		53	53		76	70			
ELP Progress	41	46	55	80	66	70	65		

** 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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	561
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	16	Yes	2	1
ELL	37	Yes	3	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	2	2
HSP	49			
MUL	24	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	42			

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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	40	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	56			
MUL	33	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	49			

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	45			46			42	83	75			41
SWD	11			31			9				4	
ELL	38			33							3	41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23			33							2	
HSP	44			45			33	86			6	46
MUL	18			30							2	
PAC												
WHT	49			49			47	83	72		6	
FRL	36			37			26	81			6	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	48	57	52	46	52	58	39	77	52			80
SWD	30	45	33	29	48	55	20					
ELL	29	43	45	26	36		20					80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14	31		24	47	60	0					
HSP	47	55	61	40	53	73	33					83
MUL	33			33								
PAC												
WHT	53	62	59	51	53	52	52	84	62			
FRL	35	52	53	31	48	64	27	68	40			70

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	46	43	50	39	38	33	31	68	70			65
SWD	31	44	55	31	42	25	15					
ELL	21	37		21	28							65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19			13								
HSP	40	38	23	34	27	8	29	64				60
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	45	64	43	40	32	34	75	72			
FRL	40	41	45	32	33	39	21	55	60			64

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	49%	53%	-4%	54%	-5%
07	2023 - Spring	38%	43%	-5%	47%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	39%	45%	-6%	47%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	54%	-2%	58%	-6%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	45%	8%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	47%	-9%	50%	-12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	44%	59%	-15%	54%	-10%
07	2023 - Spring	44%	58%	-14%	48%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	62%	-6%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	52%	64%	-12%	61%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	11%	41%	-30%	55%	-44%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	53%	45%	8%	44%	9%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	49%	-16%	51%	-18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	50%	29%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	74%	69%	5%	66%	8%

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.

Black scholars earned a 29 on the Federal Points Index in 2021-22. They were the lowest subgroup for both ELA (14) and math (24) achievement, with the lowest learning gains in ELA (31). In 2020-21, they were also the subgroup with the lowest achievement data--ELA, 19; Math, 13. The amount of black scholars enrolled at ISLWR has increased over the last three years. This leads to need for increased cultural responsiveness in classrooms and throughout the school community.

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

Both FRL and Black subgroups dropped 5 points in achievement in ELA. All other subgroups showed growth in achievement in both content areas. As noted above, school demographics have shown a change in race and ethnicity over three years, noting that our black and economically disadvantaged student populations have grown.

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.

ELA (48) and mathematics (46) achievement showed a 9 point gap compared to State (57/55) achievement. Science achievement (39) showed a 12 point gap compared to State (51) achievement.

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

Mathematics L25 showed a 4 point increase from 2019 (54) to 2022 (58). Our Hispanic population showed the most increase in ELA achievement in 2022 (47) compared to 2021 achievement (40). ELA learning gains with our Hispanic population increased from 38 to 55. Math achievement increased for all subgroups with the exception of SWD and FRL. Math L25 and learning gains increased in all subgroups, with the most gains seen by Hispanic students (26).

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

Early warning data shows a need to increase attendance supports, mainly targeting K-3 students.

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

1. Increase proficiency and learning gains for Black students (29%).
2. Increase proficiency and learning gains for Multiracial students (33%)
3. Increase proficiency and learning gains for SWD (37%).
4. Increase proficiency and learning gains for English Language Learners (40%).

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.

According to early warning data, attendance is an area of need--16% of students have missed 10% or more days.

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 2023-24 school year, the percent of students missing 10% or more will decrease from 16% to 10%, as reported by the EWS tool.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring will occur by using weekly attendance reports.

Monitors: Registrar, Character Dean, and MTSS Coordinator

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Allen (allena4@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.)

Family communication and accountability through a Multi-Tiered System of Supports: Attendance letters, attendance goals, and attendance celebrations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By approaching this through MTSS, tier 1 supports, such as letters, phone calls, and celebrations will immediately impact 100% of students.

Tier 2 supports with attendance goals and family support will affect the remaining group not showing improvement--approximately 15% of students missing 10% or more of 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.

Generate attendance letters.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Make attendance calls.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Attendance plan and goals.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: December, 2023.

Family Engagement Event

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Once per semester.

#2. 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.

Increase proficiency and learning gains for Black students (29%).

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 school year, the proficiency percentile for African American students will increase from 29 to 41, as measured by the F.A.S.T. ELA State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Growth toward proficiency will be monitored using State reporting data, MTSS data, and interim assessments.

Monitors: Principal, Instructional Coach, MTSS Coordinator

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Allen (allena4@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.)

Data-driven planning and instruction through MTSS data analysis and collaborative planning for differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected based on the current data and historical trends from school and state wide assessments. When operating through an MTSS lens to address tier 1, 2, and 3 needs, all learners' needs will be addressed.

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.

Biweekly MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Every two weeks, beginning September, 2023.

Collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Every two weeks, beginning September 2023.

#3. 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.

Increase proficiency and learning gains for Multiracial students (33%).

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 school year, the proficiency percentile for multiracial students will increase from 33 to 41, as measured by the F.A.S.T. ELA State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Growth toward proficiency will be monitored using State reporting data, MTSS data, and interim assessments.

Monitors: Principal, Instructional Coach, MTSS Coordinator

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Allen (allena4@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.)

Data-driven planning and instruction through MTSS data analysis and collaborative planning for differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected based on the current data and historical trends from school and state wide assessments. When operating through an MTSS lens to address tier 1, 2, and 3 needs, all learners' needs will be addressed.

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.

Biweekly MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning, September 2023.

Biweekly collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: Beginning, September 2023.

#4. 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.

Increase proficiency and learning gains for SWD (37%).

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 school year, the proficiency percentile for students with disabilities will increase from 37 to 45, as measured by the F.A.S.T. ELA State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Growth toward proficiency will be monitored using State reporting data, MTSS data, and interim assessments.

Monitors: Principal, Instructional Coach, MTSS Coordinator

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Allen (allena4@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.)

Data-driven planning and instruction through MTSS data analysis and collaborative planning for differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected based on the current data and historical trends from school and state wide assessments. When operating through an MTSS lens to address tier 1, 2, and 3 needs, all learners' needs will be addressed.

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.

Weekly MTSS leadership meetings with teacher accountability reviews to discuss fidelity and consistency of providing students appropriate accommodations.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: October 2023

Biweekly MTSS meetings to review data and discuss student growth.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023.

Biweekly collaborative planning with an intentional focus on differentiating SWD instruction and ESE classroom supports.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023.

#5. 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.

Increase proficiency and learning gains for English Language Learners (40%).

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 school year, the proficiency percentile for English language learners will increase from 40 to 48, as measured by the F.A.S.T. ELA State Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Growth toward proficiency will be monitored using State reporting data, MTSS data, and interim assessments.

Monitors: Principal, Instructional Coach, MTSS Coordinator

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Allen (allena4@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.)

Evidence-based strategies to support Area of Focus are verbal/linguistic support, small group, kinesthetic, visuals, extension of digital support tools for listening, speaking, reading, and writing support infused in core instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies were selected based on the current data and historical trends from school and state wide assessments; with the additional support from the WIDA Assessments and instructional tools.

These strategies were selected based on the current data and historical trends from school and state wide assessments. When operating through an MTSS lens to address tier 1, 2, and 3 needs, all learners' needs will be addressed.

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.

ESOL refresher training for instructional staff.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: December 2023.

Coaching support through modeling planning and instruction.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: December 2023.

Biweekly collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 2023.

Biweekly MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Ashley Allen (allena4@manateeschools.net)

By When: September 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 governance board meetings, pre-planning, the back to school night meetings, and Parent Action Committee meetings to review the budget, staff allocations, and resources to address the diverse range of needs.

Interventions Include:

Early Warning System Interventions

Differentiated and specialized instruction planned for during MTSS meetings and collaborative planning sessions.

MTSS

STAR/CARS literacy, Lexia, Heggerty, Foundations, Benchmark Advanced, and StudySync.

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

Students in K-2 will receive specifically targeted tier 1 core instruction, to include differentiated practices that target students' instructional levels and growth. Teachers will use a variety of researched-based practices and instructional tools to drive data-based planning and instruction, as well as infuse learning with character building and social-emotional strategies.

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

Students in grades 3-5 will receive specifically targeted tier 1 core instruction, to include differentiated practices that target students' instructional levels and growth. Teachers will integrate writing across content areas to strengthen evidence-based reasoning and comprehension.

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

As measured by the 2024 Spring ELA F.A.S.T (Star assessments), 50% or more of students will demonstrate reading proficiency by earning a level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

As measured by the 2024 Spring ELA F.A.S.T, 50% or more of students will demonstrate reading proficiency by earning a level 3 or higher.

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.

Systems for monitoring instruction and student growth toward proficiency include biweekly, facilitated collaborative planning; biweekly, facilitated MTSS and RtI meetings; classroom observations and walk-through data; and weekly instructional leadership and MTSS meetings to monitor improvement and plan instructional focuses

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Allen, Ashley, allena4@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?

Facilitated collaborative planning and MTSS/RtI meetings build teaching capacity and align instructional practices with school-wide goals. Meetings include data review, assigning appropriate instructional tools to respond to student needs, and planning engaging and differentiated lessons to close students' skill gaps and accelerate growth toward mastery. In addition to core instruction, students receive targeted group instruction to intervene, remediate, and enrich comprehension. Instructional tools and strategies include Heggerty, Foundations, Benchmark Advanced,, StudySync, Lexia, and Accelerated Reading.

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 purpose of disaggregating data, planning, implementing and monitoring best instructional practices will ensure the continuous path toward proficiency. Using a Multi-Tiered System of Supports for students and staff will promote growth and instructional change throughout the campus.

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
Biweekly collaborative planning to ensure instruction is aligned with benchmarks and individual student learning needs. This area will focus on planning with the foundational instructional programs, such as Heggerty and Foundations.	Allen, Ashley, allena4@manateeschools.net
Biweekly MTSS meetings will promote data-driven instruction using students performance reported by Star progress monitoring; F.A.S.T.; Foundations, Benchmark Advanced, and StudySync assessments; Accelerated Reading performance, and weekly standards skill checks.	Allen, Ashley, allena4@manateeschools.net
Weekly instructional leadership and MTSS meetings will align best instructional practices that are delivered during collaborative planning and Rtl meetings.	Allen, Ashley, allena4@manateeschools.net