

Manatee County Public Schools

William H. Bashaw 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	26

William H. Bashaw Elementary

3515 57TH ST E, Bradenton, FL 34208

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Bashaw Elementary School is to cultivate distinct pathways for all students to succeed. Through a STEAM model of instruction, we inspire learning with inquiry investigation, collaboration, critical thinking, creativity and authentic experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Bashaw Elementary School is to foster each child's innate curiosity and joy of discovery, empowering them to be leaders and innovators of the future.

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
Dougherty, James	Principal	Teacher Evaluation School Improvement Lead Office and Support Staff Evaluator Data/Instructional Coaching Discipline Community Outreach/United Way Facilities FTE Administrator Roster Verification SAC Facilitator/Member
Gil, Maria	Assistant Principal	Teacher Evaluation Paraprofessional Supervision and Evaluation Discipline Data/Instructional Coaching Roster Verification(Back-up) Testing Administrator (FAST, District Benchmark Assess, ESOLCoordinator With ESOL Resource Teacher Lesson Plans Report Cards/Progress Reports Textbook Administrator
Edwards, Christopher	Dean	Bullying Contact Testing Coordinator School Mentor Discipline Classroom CHAMPS Coaching PBIS Chair and Coordinator
Stutes, Necole	Instructional Coach	

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.

Goals are formulated with input from the leadership team, staff members, and families/community members through various meetings including staff and SAC meetings. Input was gathered on goals and action steps from stakeholders.

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 will be monitored through state FAST, district, and school assessments with adjustments being made throughout the year in response to data from assessments.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	75%
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: B
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	26	20	18	22	15	30	0	0	0	131	
One or more suspensions	7	0	7	9	8	20	0	0	0	51	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	32	37	34	41	29	36	0	0	0	209	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	39	12	27	35	37	48	0	0	0	198	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	41	29	36	0	0	0	106	

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	1	19	28	29	0	0	0	77

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	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	15	23	19	17	24	27	0	0	0	125	
One or more suspensions	7	5	2	4	7	3	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	40	26	0	0	0	113	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	31	41	30	0	0	0	102	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	13	26	32	37	0	0	0	112	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	15	23	19	17	24	27	0	0	0	125	
One or more suspensions	7	5	2	4	7	3	0	0	0	28	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	47	40	26	0	0	0	113	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	31	41	30	0	0	0	102	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	4	13	26	32	37	0	0	0	112	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
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*	41	51	53	40	55	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				52			42		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			19		
Math Achievement*	50	62	59	50	50	50	53		
Math Learning Gains				57			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56			59		
Science Achievement*	40	51	54	41	65	59	38		
Social Studies Achievement*					66	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					52	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	59	59	62			59		

** 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	233
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	27	Yes	4	1
ELL	33	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	22	Yes	3	1
HSP	42			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	40	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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	2	
HSP	42			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	65			
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	41			50			40					58
SWD	17			22			11				5	65
ELL	23			44			7				5	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20			28			11				4	
HSP	36			50			31				5	55
MUL	67			62							3	
PAC												
WHT	50			55			53				4	
FRL	32			43			32				5	58

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	40	52	45	50	57	56	41					62
SWD	15	39	43	19	41	50	13					38
ELL	25	41	27	26	43	47	19					62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	21	43	43	32	42	45	14					
HSP	30	42	33	41	51	46	31					64
MUL	60	70		67	80							
PAC												
WHT	56	64	64	63	67	80	63					
FRL	34	52	52	40	57	65	37					64

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	44	42	19	53	61	59	38					59
SWD	16	17	17	26	36		9					43
ELL	21	28	9	35	71		19					59
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	57		50	67		21					
HSP	33	25	9	44	57	55	29					60
MUL	56			56								
PAC												
WHT	56	52		63	67		47					
FRL	35	35	19	46	60	53	31					58

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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	54%	-15%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	39%	47%	-8%	50%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	55%	62%	-7%	59%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	64%	-13%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	61%	-17%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	38%	49%	-11%	51%	-13%

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 was at 39% proficiency
- 4th Grade ELA was at 39% proficiency
- 5th Grade Math was at 44% proficiency

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

-4th Grade ELA dropped from 41% in 21-22 to 39% in 22-23, this was the only grade level that declined in ELA or Math from the 21-22 school year to 22-23 school 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.

- 4th Grade ELA was 39% and 18% lower than the state average of 57%
- 5th Grade Math was 44% and 11% lower than the state average of 55%

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

- 3rd Grade ELA moved from 33% to 39% in proficiency
- 3rd Grade Math moved from 52% to 55% in proficiency

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

-Student attendance will need to improve to continue to make academic progress at Bashaw Elementary.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. ELA Student Growth
4. Math Student Growth
5. improving student attendance

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 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.

Based on the initial 2022-2023 FAST data, ELA proficiency is at 44% for our 3rd-5th grade students. This is lower than the district average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency in ELA from 44% to 55% by May 2024 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments
- Monthly Unit Assessments
- Classroom observations

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning and PLCs supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify needs, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Bashaw's administrative staff will ensure that teachers are instructing students on the needed standards with the highest level of rigor. Bashaw administrative team will facilitate and support data driven, standards based planning sessions.

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.

Review 2023 FAST data with teachers to determine areas of need, instructional groups, and identify needed professional development based on areas of need.

Person Responsible: James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year starting in August 2023 and concluding in May 2024.

#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.

According to our ESSA Federal Index data our Students is Disabilities subgroup fell below the 41% threshold at 32% .

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bashaw Elementary will achieve a proficiency level in ELA of 55% in the subgroup of Students with Disabilities by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify the student needs in each of these subgroups, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

If additional intervention is needed student will receive tiered instruction from one of the research based resources from the district Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree, including Literacy Footprints (K-1st grade), Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 Lessons, and Imagine Learning for ELLs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of student data along for grouping and instructional planning along with the use of intervention and tracking through the MTSS process will best support our students in these targeted subgroups to help them reach grade level proficiency in ELA.

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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to 2022-2023 attendance data, 18% of Bashaw K-5th grade students missed over 10% of school days during the school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, more than 95% of students at Bashaw Elementary students will attend school on a regular basis of over 90% of the total school days.

Monitoring:

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

- Student Attendance Data
- Teacher/Staff Observation
- MTSS Processes

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.)

Bashaw Elementary will implement a tiered Check In/Check Out system to monitor student attendance and problem solve barriers that are limiting Bashaw students ability to attend school on a regular basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This intervention will give us the ability to track student attendance and problem solve with students and families to increase their attendance.

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

#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.

According to our ESSA Federal Index data our Black/African American subgroup that feel below the 41% threshold at 34%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bashaw Elementary will achieve a proficiency level in ELA of 55% in the subgroup of Black/African American by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify the student needs in each of these subgroups, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

If additional intervention is needed student will receive tiered instruction from one of the research based resources from the district Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree, including Literacy Footprints (K-1st grade), Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 Lessons, and Imagine Learning for ELLs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of student data along for grouping and instructional planning along with the use of intervention and tracking through the MTSS process will best support our students in these targeted subgroups to help them reach grade level proficiency in ELA.

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

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

According to our ESSA Federal Index data our English Language Learner subgroup that fell below the 41% threshold at 36%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Bashaw Elementary will achieve a proficiency level in ELA of 55% in the English Language Learner subgroup by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

Monitoring:

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

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dougherty (doughertyj@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Data-driven standards based collaborative planning supported by reading coach and administrative team. Data will be utilized to identify the student needs in each of these subgroups, adjust instruction, and group students to ensure standards based instruction with a high level of instructional rigor.

If additional intervention is needed student will receive tiered instruction from one of the research based resources from the district Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree, including Literacy Footprints (K-1st grade), Benchmark Advance Differentiated Tier 2 Lessons, and Imagine Learning for ELLs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The use of student data along for grouping and instructional planning along with the use of intervention and tracking through the MTSS process will best support our students in these targeted subgroups to help them reach grade level proficiency in ELA.

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)).

Each school year Bashaw evaluates available funding and utilizes data to design programs for remediation and enrichment such as targeted small group instruction, before and after schools tutoring, and enrichment activities inside and outside of school hours.

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

Based on the PM3 ELA assessments, 45% of our Kindergarten-2nd grade students scored a level 3 or higher and are considered at or on grade level.

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

Based on the 22-23 FAST Assessment, ELA proficiency is at 44% for our 3rd-5th grade students. This falls 10 percent lower than the 50% threshold.

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

Bashaw Elementary will have 55% ELA proficiency for K-2nd grade students by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Bashaw Elementary will increase our proficiency in ELA from 40% to 55% by May 2023 as measured by the FAST assessment in ELA.

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.

- School-based formative assessments
- FAST progress monitoring assessment
- Monthly Unit Assessments
- DIBELS progress monitoring
- STAR progress monitoring

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Dougherty, James, doughertyj@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
Review 2023 FASTdata with teachers to determine areas of need, instructional groups, and identify needed professional development based on areas of need	Dougherty, James, doughertyj@manateeschools.net
Instructional implementation of strategies from research based programs outlines in our school district's Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree based on students need. Teachers will be trained by our instructional specialist on resources including Literacy Footprints, Lexia, Benchmark Advance Tier 2 Intervention, Imagine Learning for ELLs, and SIPPS.	Dougherty, James, doughertyj@manateeschools.net
Collaborative team PLCs and data chats will continue throughout the year to continue to monitor and adjust instruction and intervention throughout the school year.	Dougherty, James, doughertyj@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.

SIP will be presented to SAC, instructional staff, and community members through multiple opportunities of scheduled meetings. Once approved, the SIP will be published on the school website at manateeschools.net/bashaw

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))

Bashaw Elementary established a Parent & Family Involvement Committee this year. The purpose of this committee will be to continue to grow family and community involvement while increasing resources available to our school, students, and families.

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))

Each school year Bashaw evaluates available funding and utilizes data to design programs for remediation and enrichment such as targeted small group instruction, before and after schools tutoring, and enrichment activities inside and outside of school hours.

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))

Bashaw Elementary collaborates with local agencies such as Project Heart, F.E.L.T., local mental health agencies, and other organizations throughout the school year.

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No