

Manatee County Public Schools

H. S. Moody 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	0

H. S. Moody Elementary School

5425 38TH AVE W, Bradenton, FL 34209

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

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.

Moody Elementary is an inclusive community who values collaboration, high expectations, and independent thinking to develop tomorrow’s leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is for students to use their thinking and problem solving skills to persevere in meeting their goals.

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
Jadid, Natalie	Principal	All responsibilities of safety, instruction and the smooth operation of the school.
Francies, Krista	Assistant Principal	All responsibilities of safety, instruction and the smooth operation of the school.
Jett, Sarah	Other	Aids in the support of students for academics and behavior for the school.

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.

The SIP was developed by sharing action items in progress and those being planned monthly with the SAC team, administrative team, instructional team leaders, and faculty and staff to gain feedback on the ideas. The family and staff surveys were also used to determine needs and action items.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP is regularly monitored by the administrative leadership team as we reflect on the plan weekly, gather information about the success of the initiatives, analyze data to support and reflect on what changes may need to be made. The SIP goals are also monitored by committees who are responsible for the goals on the plan. Committees report on the data gathered for their goals monthly and share any needed items to make sure the goals are achieved. All test data is used to gauge how close we are to the SP goals and adjustments are made as needed. Revisions are made based on SAC, Committee, Data Dives and administrative leadership input. Close monitoring of our subgroups, lowest quartile and tier 3 students will be done monthly to gauge if interventions are creating effective growth.

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	76%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	2	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	19
One or more suspensions	3	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	14	8	40	34	43	0	0	0	139
Course failure in Math	0	14	10	37	37	38	0	0	0	136
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	18	15	30	41	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	8	10	10	20	36	0	0	0	84
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	18	15	30	41	0	0	0	104

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	8	3	9	10	14	0	0	0	45

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	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	51	41	44	46	42	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	1	13	23	20	24	23	0	0	0	104
Course failure in ELA	0	0	15	43	31	24	0	0	0	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	9	14	29	15	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	34	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	35	31	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	17	26	19	0	0	0	66

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	10	17	23	25	31	0	0	0	106

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	51	41	44	46	42	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	1	13	23	20	24	23	0	0	0	104
Course failure in ELA	0	0	15	43	31	24	0	0	0	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	9	14	29	15	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	33	34	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	35	31	0	0	0	66
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	17	26	19	0	0	0	66

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	10	17	23	25	31	0	0	0	106

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	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
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*	33	51	53	34	55	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				58			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			32		
Math Achievement*	46	62	59	50	50	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				59			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			45		
Science Achievement*	29	51	54	32	65	59	19		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	59	59	59	67			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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	202
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49

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	391
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	21	Yes	3	1
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	24	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	37	Yes	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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	47			

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	37	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	46			

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	33			46			29					59
SWD	18			24			5				5	24
ELL	31			52			24				5	59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			40			16				4	
HSP	30			48			24				5	58
MUL	12			35							2	
PAC												
WHT	46			50			56				4	
FRL	29			42			25				5	55

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	34	58	50	50	59	41	32					67
SWD	15	45	45	24	41	25	32					46
ELL	32	63	50	54	57	38	39					67
AMI												
ASN												

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	24	59		55	63		31					
HSP	35	60	50	48	55	32	32					66
MUL	27			47								
PAC												
WHT	41	53		49	62	50	30					
FRL	30	56	52	44	58	45	21					63

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	25	34	32	39	33	45	19					65
SWD	17	36	36	35	36	45	10					45
ELL	15	29		38	46	70	4					65
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	21		32	14		15					
HSP	20	37	33	37	39	62	6					65
MUL	35			44								
PAC												
WHT	37	40		46	30		35					
FRL	20	28	33	35	24	23	14					61

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	33%	53%	-20%	54%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	54%	-16%	58%	-20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	33%	47%	-14%	50%	-17%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	52%	62%	-10%	59%	-7%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	64%	-16%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	40%	61%	-21%	55%	-15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	49%	-20%	51%	-22%

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.

Science was our lowest performance area at 29% proficient. Contributing factors were that students are reading below grade level and reading science content presents a challenge. There was learning loss over the previous years due to COVID and attendance issues. Discipline and unprepared teachers were factors observed last year.

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

Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Background knowledge for students and academic language in science is needed which makes it difficult to read and comprehend the material. Missed opportunities to learn in prior grade levels could have been a factor.

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 scores are below the state average. More focus on early literacy and intensive interventions is needed to close the gap for our readers. Tier 1 instruction should be rigorous and provide exposure to grade level texts including productive struggle. Covid times and attendance issues have contributed to the inconsistent and lagging of learning seen.

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

Overall ELA proficiency increased. This was due to a focus on professional learning communities that focused on standards based instruction and assessment. Tiered instruction was strengthened through collaboration. Coaching and feedback in this area was provided regularly.

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

Students with disabilities and attendance rates are two concerning factors that must be addressed.

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

1. Literacy learning for all students including science literacy skills
2. Math proficiency for all students
3. Students with disabilities overall achievement increased by providing more inclusion and standards based instruction with tiered support
4. Science proficiency for 5th graders
5. Improving overall attendance of students

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 areas of focus includes reading, math, and science based on our FAST and SSA scores.

Measurable Outcome:

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

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

Monitoring:

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

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Florida's Multi-Tiered System of Support will be used to monitor all students progress towards grade level proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Action Plan

1. Facilitated Collaboration with all grade levels will be used to align instruction with the BEST Standards weekly.
2. Professional Learning Communities will be used to analyze student work on the BEST Standards, plan aligned assessments, gather data and create a strong plan for instructional support. (Bi monthly)
3. MTSS A will be used to provided specific targeted interventions for students in tier 2 and 3.
4. Administrative feedback will be provided to support teachers in the implementation of the plans, assessments and instruction on a regular basis to improve instruction.

Person Responsible: Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

By When: The action steps will be done on a regular basis. Planning is done weekly and quarterly. PLCS are done twice a month. Feedback is regular and ongoing. MTSS A is looked at on a regular basis to support and revise plans as needed.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Students with disabilities subgroup has not shown growth in many years in our school. Our goal is to include students in general education with intensive support to provide rigorous standards based learning opportunities, align students' work with grade level assessments and provide needed pre-teaching, vocabulary and reteaching opportunities using multimodal opportunities. Mixed Race subgroup will also be monitored closely to determine specific needs and provide interventions as appropriate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students with disabilities subgroup will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index from 34 to 41. Mixed Race students will increase the Federal Percent of Points Index from 37 to 41.

Monitoring:

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

Both subgroups of students will be tracked on standards based assessments and needed interventions will be applied and monitored. Supplemental tutoring and instruction will be provided to students as needed to meet with rigorous goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Natalie Jadid (jadidn@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.)

The use of the MTSS process will be used with data driven instruction to focus efforts for our subgroups below 41. Through teacher collaboration and use of high impact strategies, students will receive instruction that meets their specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies will allow teachers and support staff to provide intensive targeted instruction for the standards of need. Additionally, supports will be provided to these students to build literacy for Tier 3 small group instruction daily. An effective MTSS framework has the following components: (1) Strong, high-quality classroom instruction for all students; (2) Use of assessment data to measure and monitor academic/behavior progress; (3) Identification of at-risk students; (4) Targeted, evidenced-based interventions; and (5) Routine collaboration of school teams to determine when and where coaching and training are needed for improved learning outcomes.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Action Plan

1. Subgroup students will be identified and shared with staff to monitor.
2. Students performance on assessments and indicators weekly through interventions, assessments, and plcs will be tracked and reflected upon.
3. Adjustments will be made to the instructional plan for these students based on need.

Person Responsible: Natalie Jadid (jadidn@manateeschools.net)

By When: Identification of students was completed in August. Tracking and revision of instructional plan happens bi monthly using data provided.

#3. 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.

Moody will implement CHAMPS, PBIS and restorative practices to support all students including subgroups to have an inclusive positive school experience.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The school goal will be to increase MTSS B to support 30% less aggressive infractions among students.

Monitoring:

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

Our MTSS B team meets weekly to monitor students emotional and behavioral progress. The students of greatest need will get intensive support and interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sarah Jett (jetts@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.)

Using the RTI multi-tiered approach to problem solving for students will be implemented and will include training for teachers and the team to provide a variety of strategies to support the needs of all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The specific strategies are needed as students need individual solutions and different interventions based on the data presented. Teacher teams work together to provide the needed interventions and collect and analyze data to make decisions about how to move forward to best support the students as individuals. Students' families are included in this problem solving process.

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.

Action Plan

1. Facilitated collaboration with all grade levels will be used to discuss students in need of behavioral support with Student Support Specialists.
2. Administrative leadership team and Teacher Collaborative Teams will meet to problem solve for students to implement new interventions or improve existing plans.
3. MTSS B will be used to provided specific targeted interventions for students in tier 2 and 3.
4. Administrative feedback will be provided to support teachers in the implementation of the plans and to support students' growth.

Person Responsible: Sarah Jett (jetts@manateeschools.net)

By When: This will be an iterative process. Weekly and monthly meetings will be done throughout the year to address needs.

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).

Moody is identified as an ATSI school. The process used to review the funding allocations is shared with all stake holders. Input from all stakeholders revealed a need for more support for struggling students. Targeted support will be provided and monitored for the two subgroups identified through planning in PLCs and MTSS processes.

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-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. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development and to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning, citing evidence, and problem solving.

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

Students in grades K-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. Teachers will integrate writing across all content areas to strengthen early literacy development and to ensure students' abilities to fully express ideas through reasoning, citing evidence, and problem solving.

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-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-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.

Jadid, Natalie, jadidn@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. Flamingo Reading will target science of reading instruction for kindergarten, first grade and second grade students. Teachers will receive intensive training and support in the classroom for implementation.	Jadid, Natalie, jadidn@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.

The School improvement plan will be posted on the school webpage <https://www.manateeschools.net/moody>. It will be shared with families at our Title1 Parent and Community night and input will be gathered for revisions if needed. The plan is revisited with staff at faculty meetings and planning meetings to discuss needs and progress towards the goals. Parents help the Student Advisory Council make adjustments to the School Improvement plan and budget items. These are shared and input is used to revise as needed. Students are given information about the Title 1 SIP and other components through flyers to go home, posted on Class Dojo, Facebook, Family Events and during Parent Teacher Conference nights.

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))

H. S. Moody strives to build positive relationships with all stakeholders through parent and community events that happen every other month. Our school has an open door policy to all who need assistance and want to participate in our school. Our school has many community partners and volunteers who help our school throughout the year. Twice a year parent conferences are held in the evening to share student progress with families. Parents can request a conference at any time it is needed. Class Dojo and agendas are used daily for two way communication with families. The Parent and Family Engagement Plan can be located on our website and was also shared in paper form. <https://www.manateeschools.net/moody>

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)

The school plans to strengthen all areas of the academic program through collaborative planning, professional learning communities, setting clear instructional practices and by providing a guaranteed viable Tier 1 curriculum in all classrooms that is BEST Standards aligned. Students are grouped as needed to provide acceleration in ELA and Math daily. The PLC process used addresses all levels of student performance and designs a plan to remediate, enrich and accelerate as appropriate to the students current levels of performance on each BEST standard.

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))

Not applicable at this time.

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))

The school's counseling program includes monthly lessons on a variety of life skills and college/career readiness goals. Our school has a partnership with the Florida Center where we have a full time therapist who works with students who are need of more intensive support. Teachers and staff have been trained in teaching appropriate behaviors, conflict resolution and building relationships.

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))

Monthly lessons are conducted with students in our school to prepare and educate them about postsecondary opportunities.

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).

Our MTSS B system has been established to provide tiered behavior support to students who demonstrate a need. Our Student Support Specialists monitor student behavioral data with teachers and create plans to support students in the classroom. Training, mentoring and classroom support is provided in implementing behavior plans and interventions to improve behavior.

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))

Professional learning opportunities happen frequently at our school through job embedded collaborative learning. Teachers work in professional learning communities weekly to analyze data, plan instructional strategies for all levels of learners, implement and reflect on the instructional plan and then reflect and review the progress made. During these sessions, specific professional learning and training is conducted to help meet the needs of the students and build teacher capacity. The focus of these data teams in ELA and Math.

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))

Our school provides Kindergarten activities to Pre-School students who will attend our school the next year. Families bring their preschool aged children to all of our school wide events.