

Manatee County Public Schools

Dr Mona Jain Middle 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Dr Mona Jain Middle School

12205 44TH AVE, E Bradenton, FL 34211

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

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.

Dr. Mona Jain Middle School will foster a safe, caring and creative learning environment that inspires students to realize their full potential as they positively impact the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating an environment that fosters excellence.

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
Dudczak, Jason	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Barlaug, Kate	Principal	Principal
McClellan, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Beck, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Chair
Rivard, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Chair
Sperry, Hilary	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Chair
Anderson, Heather	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Department Chair
Human, Gregory	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Reyes, Katelyn	Teacher, K-12	Electives Department Chair
Knips, Matthew	Teacher, K-12	AVID Department Chair
Csogi, Lindsay	Dean	SSS
Hamel, Kelly	Dean	SSS
Kotler, Michelle	Teacher, ESE	ESE Department Chair
Callihan, Amanda	School Counselor	School Counselor
Lewis, Rene	School Counselor	School Counselor
McDaniel, Jeffrey	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Department Chair

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.

ILT will work with admin to develop the SIP plan. Goals will be identified using state assessment data as well as early warning 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))

SIP will be reviewed monthly by the admin team. The SIP will be reviewed quarterly by ILT. When the teams meet current data will be discussed and the plan will be modified accordingly. ESSA students will be monitored to ensure they are meeting goals including proficiency.

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)	Middle School 6-8
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	32%
Charter School	No
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A
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	52	112	89	253	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	41	47	118	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	9	8	30	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	14	13	39	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	33	69	131	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	30	35	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	86	112	279	

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	35	39	38	112

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	88	88	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	41	61	119	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	48	61	146	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	61	52	154	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	51	59	171	

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	40	61	72	173

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	88	88	230	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	41	61	119	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	17	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	48	61	146	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	61	52	154	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	51	59	171	

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	40	61	72	173

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	60	47	49	67	49	50	66		
ELA Learning Gains				58			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			34		
Math Achievement*	74	61	56	70	35	36	69		
Math Learning Gains				59			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			41		
Science Achievement*	63	48	49	68	57	53	67		
Social Studies Achievement*	84	70	68	89	54	58	91		
Middle School Acceleration	87	81	73	83	47	49	90		
Graduation Rate					47	49			
College and Career Acceleration					76	70			
ELP Progress	73	34	40	48	79	76	68		

* 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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	441
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	634
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	30	Yes	2	1
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	32	Yes	2	
HSP	62			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	57			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	51			

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%
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	50			

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	60			74			63	84	87			73
SWD	19			29			17	53			4	
ELL	27			44			11	44			5	73
AMI												
ASN	90			97			83		94		4	
BLK	29			32			29	38			4	
HSP	43			60			42	74	87		6	67
MUL	76			79				93	83		4	
PAC												
WHT	66			82			70	90	86		5	
FRL	40			51			40	62	78		6	70

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	67	58	43	70	59	49	68	89	83			48
SWD	28	40	30	26	39	36	33	56	58			
ELL	37	53	46	33	38	35	28	69	67			48
AMI												
ASN	75	62		88	70		75	100	88			

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
BLK	32	33	29	31	36	22	47	63				
HSP	47	54	42	52	52	43	42	73	71			38
MUL	82	69		81	67		79	100	85			
PAC												
WHT	76	61	47	77	62	59	78	96	85			
FRL	48	53	38	47	46	39	45	73	71			38

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	66	57	34	69	47	41	67	91	90			68
SWD	28	41	34	32	26	30	13	57				
ELL	36	50	38	35	30	28	40	68				68
AMI												
ASN	89	85		92	70			100	93			
BLK	34	36	21	32	32	31	15	71	54			
HSP	48	55	35	50	39	31	50	81	90			69
MUL	77	64		73	57							
PAC												
WHT	74	58	37	80	51	50	81	94	92			
FRL	41	43	27	42	35	36	40	73	70			66

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
07	2023 - Spring	61%	43%	18%	47%	14%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	45%	13%	47%	11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	45%	11%	47%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	54%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	48%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	41%	3%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	62%	45%	17%	44%	18%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	58%	37%	50%	45%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	56%	44%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	69%	16%	66%	19%

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.

SWD and African American students had the lowest proficiency rate for 22-23. Teachers with SWD students need more support with modifying and accommodating the curriculum. Missed instructional time for students with SWD and African Americans. A culture among staff that low performing students can't master the curriculum and reach proficiency. Student misbehavior that led to students being out of class led to lower achievement for both categories. ELL students were not provided high level supports to overcome their language barriers.

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

ELA achievement showed the greatest decline with a 8% decline from the previous year. A new curriculum, a new test, new textbook resources. Lack of intensive reading courses to provide support to low performing students. Writing test not included in the data this year.

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

We exceeded the state in all areas of assessments.

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

Math achievement increased by 7%. A change to the new standards and how they taught the standards created a major achievement increase. Tutoring before and after school to support students may have helped the increase.

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

Students with 10% or more absenteeism.
Students with 1 or more suspension.

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

Reduce absenteeism.
Increase ELA student achievement.
Decrease student suspensions.
Increase student recognition.

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

To increase the overall achievement levels for Black/African American Students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Black/African Americans under ESSA are currently at 37% proficiency and the goal will be to reach 42% proficiency. This will be a 5% increase in overall proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring and district common quarterly assessments, and district intensive programs will be reviewed by ILT and admin.

Students not meeting the minimum proficiency will be identified for teachers to target within their instruction.

Students will be placed in intensive reading/math for Tier 2 and 3 support.

Students will complete quarterly academic tracking sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@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.)

Intensive reading and math courses with specific measurable goals.

Lexia, Acaletics and Dreambox are the district mandated programs to monitor and assess students weekly.

Students will be referred to MTSS when these interventions do not improve the areas of concern.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these interventions is to use data-driven instruction for the opportunities of continuous analysis of mastery of state standards. The evidence will include results from state and district common assessments through the use of collaborative reflections, and classroom observations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify Black/ African American students who have at least 2 EWS indicators.

Person Responsible: Jason Dudczak (dudczak2j@manateeschools.net)

By When: August 30, 2023

Place students who are a level 1 or 2 in intensive math and or reading.

Person Responsible: Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@manateeschools.net)

By When: 8/10/2023

Tracking of academics (Quarterly grades, Quarterly District Common Assessments, Progress Monitoring), attendance and behavior through homerooms. We will use a form that students will complete on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Entire Year monitoring.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

ELA proficiency has a 8% drop from the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency will increase by 8%.

Monitoring:

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

Progress Monitoring scores and district quarterly common assessments. Implementing quarterly writing plan across the curriculum. Intensive reading data from Lexia. Write Score data for Q1 and Q3. Student academic tracking sheets quarterly in homeroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@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.)

MTSS.

LEXIA Data

WriteScore Data

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these interventions is to use data-driven instruction for the opportunities of continuous analysis of mastery of state standards. The evidence will include results from state and district common assessments through the use of collaborative reflections and classroom observations.

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.

We will identify students below proficiency and low level 3's.

Person Responsible: Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@manateeschools.net)

By When: 8/20/2023

PD to support reading and writing across the content.

Department meetings to focus on areas of concern within ELA.

Common planning days for ELA teachers to review data and drive instruction with data.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

All level 1 and 2 students will be placed in intensive reading.

Person Responsible: Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@manateeschools.net)

By When: 8/20/2023

Implement a school wide writing plan to include PEARL strategies. Writing will occur quarterly across all subject areas.

Person Responsible: Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

School wide read aloud in homeroom by grade level. Students will each receive a copy of the book and be able to annotate the text as they read.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: On-going throughout the year.

#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.

According to ESSA students with disabilities were below the federal index of 41%. Reviewing the data it was identified that the students on alternative assessment were will below the index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will increase achievement by 5% which will result in 43% proficiency taking them above the ESSA index.

Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring and quarterly benchmarks and district intensive programs will be reviewed by ILT and admin. Students not meeting the minimum proficiency will be identified for teachers to target within their instruction. Students will be placed in intensive reading/math for Tier 2 and 3 support. Students will complete quarterly academic tracking sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jason Dudczak (dudczak2j@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.)

Intensive reading and math courses with specific measurable goals. LEXIA, Acacletics and DREAMBOX are the district mandated programs to monitor and assess students weekly. Students will be referred to MTSS when the interventions do not improve the areas of concern.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting these interventions is to use data-driven instruction for the opportunities of continuous analysis of mastery of state standards. The evidence will include results from state and district common assessments through the use of collaborative reflections, and classroom observations.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Identify students with disabilities that are below the 43% goal.

Person Responsible: Jason Dudczak (dudczak2j@manateeschools.net)

By When: 8/30/2023

Ensure all students that are level 1 or 2 and below the 43% proficiency level are placed in Intensive reading/math.

Person Responsible: Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@manateeschools.net)

By When: 8/10/2023

Tracking of academics (quarterly grades, quarterly benchmarks, progress monitoring) attendance and behavior through homerooms. We will use a form that students will complete on a quarterly basis.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Entire Year

Teachers will run a report from FOCUS of all students with IEP's accommodations and modifications to use in class.

Person Responsible: Danielle McClellan (mcclelland@manateeschools.net)

By When: 8/20/2023

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Student and staff morale was greatly affected by leadership changes throughout the year. It was noted that students and staff were not being recognized for positive actions.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce referrals by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly reports ran by admin and shared with the staff.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@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.)

MTSS

Positive supports to include: Friday Bull Cart, Quarterly rewards, Student of the Month.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Creating a school that has positive rewards should decrease negative student behavior as a result of them having something to work for.

This will also improve the school culture for the entire school community.

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.

Student behavior card for small infractions as well as positive interactions.

Person Responsible: Jason Dudczak (dudczak2j@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Students will monitor behavior through homeroom data tracking sheets.

Person Responsible: Jason Dudczak (dudczak2j@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Weekly bull cart for students to redeem bull stickers for various items.

Person Responsible: Jason Dudczak (dudczak2j@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Student of the month recognition based on the LifeSkills monthly character trait.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing

Quarterly reward assemblies for students who met the behavior requirements.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Grade level expectation meetings at the beginning of the year and in January.

Person Responsible: Kate Barlaug (barlaugk@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing