

Manatee County Public Schools

Manatee Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Manatee Elementary School

1609 6TH AVE E, Bradenton, FL 34208

<https://www.manateeschools.net/manateeel>

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Manatee Elementary School partners directly with the families and community to focus on consistent Attendance, appropriate Behavior, academic Competencies, whole-child Development, engaging Enrichment, and comprehensive Health.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Manatee Elementary strives to achieve: improved student learning, stronger families, and a healthier community.

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
Gonzalez, Lourdes	Principal	
Santora, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Anzelone, Deborah	Other	
Engram, Lisa	Math Coach	Assist and support the principal with the implementation of the math curriculum and with providing mentoring, coaching, and modeling support to teachers.

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.

SAC Meetings occur on a monthly basis. The School Improvement Plan will be communicated to all stakeholders during the monthly meetings and updates regarding data will be shared. Also, since Manatee Elementary is a community partner school data and the School Improvement Plan will be communicated to our community partners.

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))

SIP will be monitored through various activities. First, ITL meetings occur on a monthly basis where instructional leadership team will review formative and summative data. These meetings will support with monitoring the instructional components that are outlined in the SIP and ensure alignment and implementation. Secondly, monitoring will occur for Stakeholders during SAC meetings to share instructional goals and outcomes as the year progresses. Third, through collaborative planning with grade levels teams supported by instructional leadership teachers will be versed in application of strategies as outlined in the SIP and plan in accordance to formative and summative data.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	94%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 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	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	13	12	52	26	16	0	0	0	119
Course failure in Math	0	10	10	49	22	15	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	55	37	44	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	45	32	45	0	0	0	122
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

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	7	3	15	9	2	0	0	0	36

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	52	0	0	0	0	0	52
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	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 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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide 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	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	19	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	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 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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide 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	7	3	15	9	2	0	0	0	36

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	19	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	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*	22	51	53	22	55	56	21		
ELA Learning Gains				40			28		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			52		
Math Achievement*	33	62	59	38	50	50	40		
Math Learning Gains				51			51		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			50		
Science Achievement*	17	51	54	13	65	59	19		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	64	59	59	51			45		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	154
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	16	Yes	2	2
ELL	31	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	18	Yes	2	2
HSP	33	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	2	
FRL	31	Yes	2	1

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	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	35	Yes	1	
FRL	38	Yes	1	

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	22			33			17					64
SWD	5			15			6				5	53
ELL	22			38			18				5	64
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16			25			7				4	
HSP	24			37			22				5	64
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			33							2	
FRL	22			33			17				5	64

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	22	40	53	38	51	46	13					51
SWD	10	24	40	19	38	38	7					33
ELL	24	39	53	48	54	40	25					51
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14	38	54	25	41	41	6					
HSP	26	42	47	48	60	58	21					52
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	32	25		36	46							
FRL	21	40	50	36	51	46	12					51

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	21	28	52	40	51	50	19					45
SWD	10	35	53	14	30	38	5					25
ELL	21	26		43	50		16					45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	16	25		32	48	64	9					
HSP	23	28	58	46	52		21					47
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45			55								
FRL	21	27	56	39	47	47	16					41

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	25%	53%	-28%	54%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	54%	-21%	58%	-25%
03	2023 - Spring	14%	47%	-33%	50%	-36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	30%	62%	-32%	59%	-29%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	64%	-24%	61%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	30%	61%	-31%	55%	-25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	15%	49%	-34%	51%	-36%

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.

3rd Grade ELA baseline data was 14 percent. Various reasons contributed to this proficiency level: lack of teacher content knowledge, student deficits, and implementation of new standards. Data comparison from PM 1 proficiency was 0% and increased to 14% by PM3.

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

Math in 5th and 3rd demonstrated the greatest decline from the 2022 school year. Various reasons contributed to this proficiency level: lack of teacher content knowledge, student deficits, and implementation of new standards.

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.

3rd grade ELA and Math had the greatest gap as compared to the State average. Various reasons contributed to this proficiency level: lack of teacher content knowledge, student deficits, and implementation of new standards.

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

4th Grade ELA and Math demonstrated the most improvement. ELA increasing from 17% proficiency to 34% proficiency. Math increasing from 34% proficiency to 48% proficiency.

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

The amount of level 1 ELA students in 3-5 grade and the amount of 3rd grade retained students(55).

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

- Focus on 3rd ELA and Math
- Focus on rising 4th graders in ELA and Math
- Focus on 5th grade ELA, Math and Science
- Focus on 2nd grade ELA

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

The Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), which includes VPK through grade 5 in reading and mathematics at the elementary school level, will be administered as a progress monitoring assessment three times a year. In a setting of school turnaround it is critical to incorporate alignment to the new BEST standards and use it as a driving force for planned instructional engagement across all core content areas. The students in each subgroup must have access to aligned, grade level standards both in the core learning environment (Tier I instruction) and while engaging in intervention groups (Tier II and Tier III instruction) across the many departments that service the varying needs of our student population. When teachers are prepared for instructional implementation after carefully incorporating best practices for instructional strategies using an aligned curriculum developed in Collaborative Planning Sessions and Professional Learning Communities (PLC's), the students are more likely to engage in rigorous lessons that deepen their understanding of the standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By October 2023, at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks according to learning walk data.

December 2023, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this strategy using classroom observations, a review of lesson plans, attendance at grade-level collaborative planning sessions, PLCs, and monthly progress monitoring assessments. Coaches will submit weekly coaching logs providing. Collaborative planning sessions will all use a common planning protocol developed for Manatee Elementary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lourdes Gonzalez (gonzalezl@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.)

An Instructional Leadership Team member will provide instructional modeling and support within the classrooms at each grade level. Additionally, members of the Instructional Leadership Team will present school-wide. Professional Development that is based on current student data. This work is to ensure all students receive consistent and effective standards-based instructional delivery in all academic areas and at all grade levels of the B.E.S.T. and Florida State Standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The first step will be providing Professional Development based on the needs of the teachers. The next step will be for the leadership team to conduct classroom observation. Feedback will be given to the teachers based on the findings of the observation. Monthly progress monitoring of all curricular assessments will be conducted by students and

monitored by the leadership team. These assessments for progress monitoring will be created using CFAs and iReady Growth Monitoring Assessments. Data Chats and Professional Learning Communities will be held to share best practices.

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. Teachers will participate in NCH collaborative planning sessions grounded in the explicit instruction of standards. Planning is facilitated by the reading and math coach, school coordinator, or administration using a planning protocol. Expectations for student learning will be mapped out during planning. Administration will monitor instruction through look fors and walks. Lesson plans will be monitored and submitted weekly.
2. Targeted walk-through look fors data will be collected to monitor trends on teacher practice and transfer of planning. Feedback will be shared with ILT, and individual teachers to build teacher capacity.
3. Teachers will participate in professional learning opportunities focused on building knowledge of the standards, curriculum, and implementing high-yield instructional strategies

Person Responsible: Lourdes Gonzalez (gonzalezl@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

1. Tutoring instruction in ELA, Math, and Science will be implemented throughout the school week to increase student achievement. Tutoring will focus on benchmark aligned instruction and will take place in small groups before and after the school day by certified personnel.
2. FAST data PM1 will be used to identify students who are in need of tutoring support in addition to students in ESSA subgroups and L25 students.
3. Tutoring will include supplemental resources that are in addition to the core curriculum for ELA, Math, and Science.
4. Tutoring teachers will submit plans for tutoring instruction weekly and fidelity walks will take place to monitor implementation of the tutoring program.

Person Responsible: Lourdes Gonzalez (gonzalezl@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

1. A math coach will provide coaching and modeling of instructional strategies and lessons. Coaching plans will be submitted for review by administration. The math coach will monitor the fidelity of the mathematics program by conducting learning walks.
2. A resource teacher will be allocated to provide an additional unit of support with benchmark aligned instruction. The support of this position will be monitored through walkthroughs and observations by administration.

Person Responsible: Lourdes Gonzalez (gonzalezl@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Manatee Elementary had 100% teacher retention as compared to previous years where retention was around 30%. This is due to establishing positive environment and building relationships between teachers, administration, and families.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Provide peer mentor support based on grade level needs. Coordinate efforts to identify talent on campus and utilize human resource capital to continue positive working environment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur through weekly walks based on tiered needs of teachers. Data will be collected, reviewed in ILT, and goals established with instructional coaching model.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lourdes Gonzalez (gonzalezl@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.)

Scheduled coaching and modeling. Provide tiered coaching support for teachers at Manatee Elementary. Coaching with targeted focus will occur at least 2 times per week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Developing an environment of coaching where everyone's talents are used to coach and support one another builds a positive teaching culture. Trust and collaboration are placed at the foundation of the system to develop systematic coaching and support for each individual in the system.

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.

Schoolwide instructional practices will be monitored through the review of collaborative planning notes, lesson plans, and grade level instructional alignment of standards, tasks, and assignments through formative assessment practices in reading and writing that meet grade level benchmark expectations. The administration will participate in regularly scheduled walkthroughs to monitor instructional transfer from lesson planning through implementation.

Person Responsible: Deborah Anzelone (anzeloned@manateeschools.net)

By When: Weekly based on instructional coaching schedule.

#3. 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.

SWD population at Manatee EL has performed below 32% proficiency for the past two years. Strategic supplemental instruction will be implemented to address reading deficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, the ELA proficiency of the SWD population will increase from 10% to 33% as identified on the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Lexia Core data will be pulled bi-weekly to monitor progress of students. Teachers will use data to develop personalized instruction for identified students bi-monthly. Students will take ownership of data through data chats with instructional leadership team.

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.)

For the 23-24 school year Manatee EI will implement Lexia® Core5® Reading Program – Struggling Readers. Lexia® Core5® Reading (Core5) is a blended learning program that aims to accelerate the development of fundamental literacy skills for students of all abilities in grades pre-K-5. Core5 provides explicit, systematic instruction through personalized learning paths. Lexia is an ESSA approved program with a "strong" rating to support struggling readers in K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Year 1 of Implementation for the School District of Manatee County.

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#4. 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.

Black population at Manatee EL has performed below 32% proficiency for the past two years. Strategic supplemental instruction will be implemented to address reading deficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, the ELA proficiency of the SWD population will increase from 10% to 33% as identified on the FAST assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Lexia Core data will be pulled bi-weekly to monitor progress of students. Teachers will use data to develop personalized instruction for identified students bi-monthly. Students will take ownership of data through data chats with instructional leadership team.

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.)

For the 23-24 school year Manatee EI will implement Lexia® Core5® Reading Program – Struggling Readers. Lexia® Core5® Reading (Core5) is a blended learning program that aims to accelerate the development of fundamental literacy skills for students of all abilities in grades pre-K-5. Core5 provides explicit, systematic instruction through personalized learning paths. Lexia is an ESSA approved program with a "strong" rating to support struggling readers in K-5.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Year 1 of Implementation for the School District of Manatee County.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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)).

In collaboration with the school administrative team, the Department of Federal Programs and Grants, along with the Executive Directors and curriculum team provide CSI schools support with aligning resources based on the school's areas of Focus. The team met in July of 2023 to review the UNISG grant application, SIP template, and additional funding sources to brainstorm with CSI's school to allocate funds based on the school's Areas of Focus. Feedback regarding plans were provided by the Federal Program and Grants team to ensure all UNSIG budgets were aligned to the assurances as identified in the grant application.

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 grades K-2/3-5 will receive direct and explicit instruction on the ELA B.E.S.T standards. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Instruction will address both language comprehension and word recognition strands and will integrate writing across all content areas.

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

Students in grades K-2/3-5 will receive direct and explicit instruction on the ELA B.E.S.T standards. Additional opportunities for targeted small group instruction and tiered interventions will be provided based on progress monitoring data. Instruction will address both language comprehension and word recognition strands and will integrate writing across all content areas.

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 2024 ELA Spring FAST, 50% or more of students in grades K-2/3-5 will earn a level 3 or higher.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

As measured by 2024 ELA Spring FAST, 50% or more of students in grades K-2/3-5 will earn 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 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

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gonzalez, Lourdes, gonzalezl@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 to increase teacher expertise of remedial and intervention instruction for small groups and opportunities for problem-solving, discussion of high-effect practices, and ongoing review of student performance data. Teachers will use Decision-Tree instructional materials, including Benchmark Advance, Lexia CORE, guided reading, SRA, and/or SIPPs, to ensure explicit and rigorous instruction for intervention.

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 planning, implementing, and monitoring responsive instruction is to ensure the progression of student learning and increase grade-level literacy proficiency. Effectively delivered core, remedial, and intervention instruction will move students along the trajectory toward proficiency. The Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan, Decision-Trees, and Literacy Leadership Teams will provide guidance on literacy intervention instruction.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

All action steps for Benchmark-aligned Instruction also apply to the RAISE Area of Focus, specifically strengthening systems to monitor Tier 1 instruction and building teacher capacity through coaching for accelerated improvement.

Santora, Jennifer,
santoraj@manateeschools.net

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Back to school night, 1st Monthly SAC Meetings

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Title I plan, CNA use the needs assessment from the title I to here for these sessions, Project heart,

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

See detailed Family Engagement plan
(copy it and put it here)

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Manatee Elementary is designated as the first Community Partner school in the School District of Manatee County. Through coordinated efforts between the Children's Home Society, community-based organizations, and various entitlement grant resource supports, Manatee is able to increased access of resources to support the family and the whole child, academically, physically, socially, and mentally.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Manatee Elementary provides these services through the Community Partnership Services.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We promote post secondary education and provide five Take Stock in Children Scholarships on a yearly basis

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We follow the district SPARK Program and the State's MTSS Model.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Manatee Elementary had a 100% retention last year and this is a major step since this has never happened before at this school.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

We have 4 pre-kinder classes and continue promoting for more classes.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction				\$235,805.53
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	130	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$49,937.75
			<i>Notes: Resource Teacher to provide benchmark-aligned instruction to increase student growth and achievement</i>			
	5100	120	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.1	\$5,850.00
			<i>Notes: Non Contracted Hourly for Teachers (NCH) to provide additional tutoring instruction</i>			
	5100	150	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.05	\$1,080.00
			<i>Notes: Non Contracted Hourly for Paraprofessionals (NCH) to provide additional tutoring instruction</i>			
	5100	210	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$6,776.56
			<i>Notes: Resource Teacher Retirement</i>			
	5100	210	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$793.85
			<i>Notes: NCH Teacher Retirement</i>			
	5100	210	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$146.56
			<i>Notes: NCH Tutoring Paraprofessional Retirement</i>			

	5100	220	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$3,820.24
<i>Notes: FICA- Resource Teacher 7.65%</i>						
	5100	220	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$447.53
<i>Notes: FICA, NCH Teachers Tutoring</i>						
	5100	220	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$82.62
<i>Notes: FICA, NCH paraprofessionals- Tutoring</i>						
	5100	231	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	\$8,520.00
<i>Notes: Resource Teacher Health Insurance</i>						
	5100	232	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$114.86
<i>Notes: Resource Teacher Life Insurance</i>						
	5100	240	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$624.23
<i>Notes: Resource Teacher, Worker's Comp</i>						
	5100	240	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$73.13
<i>Notes: NCH Teacher, Tutoring, Worker's Comp</i>						
	5100	240	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$13.50
<i>Notes: NCH Paraprofessional, Tutoring, Worker's Comp</i>						
	6400	120	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.64	\$36,958.61
<i>Notes: Facilitated Collaborative Planning</i>						
	5100	130	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$69,338.15
<i>Notes: Math Resource Teacher to support student growth and achievement and coaching support for teachers as needed</i>						
	5100	210	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$9,409.19
<i>Notes: Retirement Math Resource Teacher 13.57%</i>						
	5100	220	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$5,304.37
<i>Notes: Math Resource Teacher FICA -7.65%</i>						
	5100	231	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$10,858.35
<i>Notes: Math Resource Teacher Health & Hospitalizations - 15.66%</i>						
	5100	232	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$159.48
<i>Notes: Math Resource Teacher Life Insurance - 0.23%</i>						

	5100	240	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$866.73
			<i>Notes: Math Resource Teacher Worker's Compensation -1.25%</i>			
	6400	330	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$4,147.50
			<i>Notes: Out of County Travel to attend BSI Institute utilized for mileage, hotels, per diems, etc</i>			
	5100	510	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.0	\$1,287.70
			<i>Notes: Instructional Supplies to support all areas of instruction including writing across all content areas (notebooks, pens, pencils, consumable workbooks, etc)</i>			
	6400	130	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG	0.15	\$8,892.00
			<i>Notes: NCH for Math & Resource Teachers to facilitate collaborative planning sessions</i>			
	6400	210	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$1,206.64
			<i>Notes: NCH for Math Resource Teacher to facilitate collaborative planning sessions Retirement System - 13.57%</i>			
	6400	220	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$680.24
			<i>Notes: NCH for Math Resource Teacher to facilitate collaborative planning sessions FICA -7.65%</i>			
	6400	240	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$111.15
			<i>Notes: NCH for Math Resource Teacher to facilitate collaborative planning sessions Worker's Compensation -1.25%</i>			
	6400	210	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$5,015.28
			<i>Notes: Non Contracted Hourly Facilitated Collaborative Planning for Teachers Retirement System - 13.57%</i>			
	6400	220	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$2,827.33
			<i>Notes: Non Contracted Hourly Facilitated Collaborative Planning for Teachers FICA -7.65%</i>			
	6400	240	0151 - Manatee Elementary School	UniSIG		\$461.98
			<i>Notes: Non Contracted Hourly Facilitated Collaborative Planning for Teachers Worker's Compensation -1.25%</i>			
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment				\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American				\$0.00
					Total:	\$235,805.53

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No